The Forum

JULY, 1894.

THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

SHORTLY after his election to the Presidency, George Washington received many congratulatory addresses, among others one couched in terms of warm and loyal devotion from his Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. This address was signed in behalf of the clergy by Father John Carroll, and in behalf of the Roman Catholic laity by "Charles Carroll of Carrollton," and others.

President Washington did not deem it beneath his dignity to make a special reply to the address thus presented. He accepted the congratulations "with much satisfaction," and alluded with feeling to "the able support and extraordinary candor of his fellow-citizens of all denominations." He then proceeded, in language that may be treated as displaying a prophetic vision of the injustice which some of his most loyal and patriotic fellow-citizens would one day encounter, to use these words:

> "I hope ever to see America among the foremost nations in examples of justice and liberality. And I presume that your fellow-citizens will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of their revolution and the establishment of their government, or the important assistance which they received from a nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

It is pleasant to read this just and dignified tribute emanating from a source which Americans have not yet learned to treat otherwise than with respect. It may help to purify the atmosphere when we are compelled to discuss subjects that tend, by their very nature, to arouse indignation and to create bitterness of feeling; for experience, not confined to any one country or period, has taught that Charity looks in vain for a part in religious discussion. She may

Copyright, 1893, by the Forum Publishing Company.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warn in unheeded whispers that she alone is entitled to preside over and govern the debate; but the clamor of intolerance drowns her gentle accents and forbids her presence. Men reputed kind and wise in the ordinary concerns of life lay aside their usual methods of treating their adversaries in debate; to differ from them on subjects most abstruse is a sign of diabolical perverseness; liberty of opinion is the one liberty that it were crime to allow; the ordinary extension of Christian charity becomes a weak exhibition of loose moral principles, not to be tolerated for one moment. The most curious feature in the frequently recurring drama is that the fiercest and most uncompromising foes of religious liberty are often those who care least about religion itself. They believe, or have been told, that Great is the Diana of the Ephesians, and beyond this rudimentary supply of religious principles they have little to show. But upon so slight a stock in trade as this, they will howl as loudly as though they were experts and had grown pale over the study of learned and obscure folios. When they have stopped from exhaustion, or because they have won the day, they are—or would be if they thought about it at all—puzzled to know what the quarrel was about, and why they had been eminently cruel and unjust.

The existence of an organized body of men in these United States, leagued together for the avowed purpose of ostracising eight millions of their fellow-citizens, seems at first sight incredible. That citizens of ordinary intelligence, with no special grievance against society, professing loyalty of the highest order to a government based upon religious toleration, should undertake a crusade of this character, must, when unexplained, fill the average citizen with wonder. If one hundred years of free government, common schools, and countless newspapers, have done no better than this for the American people, there must be something imperfect in our machinery, or a natural incapacity of our soil to produce good fruit. Envy, uncharitableness and fanaticism are bad fruit. Whether they are merely the periodical weeds that spring up to-day and die to-morrow, or the result of such husbandry as we have given to the soil for a century, is a vital question. Of itself, as an isolated fact in our history, the American Protective Association deserves only passing notice. It may temporarily disturb the even current of our harmonious progress, and may for the time being sow dissensions among citizens of the same country. But History has transmitted her record to us in vain if we have not learned

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the selfish or misguided efforts of a few fanatics cannot long mar the serenity of a great people. This is not the first time, even in our own history, that the spirit of persecution has joined party-spirit for mischievous ends. Catholics, even in our own America, have perished because they worshipped the God of their fathers as their fathers taught them. It may yet happen that, encouraged by the indorsement which the American Protective Association receives from reputable persons, nuns may again be driven in terror from their homes, asylums devoted to the noblest works of charity may be sacked and burned, and venerable priests treated as malignant enemies of the nation. But even should this come to pass—nay, because it does come to pass—the American people will not be disturbed from the path of their traditions. They tolerate these eccentricities until they ripen into crimes, and then they stamp them out for years to come.

But only for years, not for ever. The disease of which these manifestations are a symptom is not easily rooted out. There is a periodicity about the paroxysms that likens them to ague. In 1834 some of these zealous defenders of the Protestant faith manifested their orthodoxy and patriotism by attacking a convent and burning it to the ground, with books, musical instruments, pictures, and other articles calculated to inflame the ire of good anti-Popery churchmen. In 1844 the slumbering elements were rekindled, and the Know-Nothing movement was started. This is so manifestly and traceably the origin and model of the present American Protective Association movement that it deserves a moment's attention.

The cardinal principles of the Know-Nothing order were simple and intelligible, if nothing more. They involved three propositions: (1) that no foreigner should be naturalized under twenty-one years of age; (2) that the Catholic religion was dangerous to the country; (3) that the Protestant Scriptures should be the foundation of all common-school education.

These premises being once established, it was obviously proper and consistent with the objects of this patriotic organization to attack nunneries, a proceeding which offered a double advantage: first, that of bearding the scarlet woman in her very home; and second, that of making an onslaught upon defenseless women and orphans, whose means of repelling aggression were little more than tears and prayers. These agencies of self-protection were not likely to repel or alarm the assailants. So the old story was repeated. Churches were sacked and burned to the ground. The emblems of Popery

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were ruthlessly desecrated and destroyed, and the mob enjoyed all that satisfaction which unbridled destruction and unresisted attack upon helpless victims can produce in patriotic breasts. Philadelphia was especially the scene of rioting and disorder. New York and Boston, to their credit be it said, did not afford so favorable a field to these lawless plunderers. The authorities, if they did not take more pains, were at least more successful in defending life and property.

Then Politics took these ardent protectors of American institutions under its wing. Candidates were elected, as they are now, on anti-Popery principles. Public men, forgetting that the American people will not long tolerate cowardly aggression and senseless prejudice, lent their honorable names to these pestilent disturbers of the public peace. But two short years were enough. Those who had been misled by empty clamor and the excitement of the hour were forced back into obscurity, and the problem was not definitely settled whether or not the Catholic religion was dangerous to the country, nor was it adjudicated by the sovereign judge, the People, that the Protestant Scriptures should be the foundation of all common-school education, whether Catholics and Hebrews liked it or not.

Without stopping to consider other and minor manifestations of this disease, which have broken out at times from our earliest history, it is well now to draw a parallel between the Know-Nothing organization and the American Protective Association, to ascertain how far, if at all, they are alike in spirit and in conduct. History, indeed, is of no use, and preaches in a desert, if its ghastly record bears with it no fruit in the way of lesson and of sermon. If the present anti-Catholic society differs only from the Know-Nothing movement in that it is more hypocritical in its expressions and more subtle in its action, then the fate of the latter, as taught us by history, will enable us to prophesy the fate of the former. The causes that have produced the rise and fall of the one must necessarily determine the decay and dissolution of the other. Labels do not change the character of merchandise, although they often defraud the honest purchaser. But the consumer soon discovers the deception practised upon his good faith, and then turns his back upon the dishonest peddler of adulterated wares.

We have seen that two of the main articles of the Know-Nothing catechism were, that the Catholic religion was dangerous to the country, and that the Protestant Scriptures should be the foundation of all common-school education.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What now says the American Protective Association? That no Catholic must ever be allowed to occupy any office in the gift of the people, and that no Catholic must ever be allowed the privilege of earning a livelihood in this country unless his labor cannot be replaced by that of a Protestant. These principles are considered essential to the preservation of American institutions.

Of course the pretence that an organization, secret in its character and confined to a certain mysterious and unknown body of citizens, is entitled to take upon itself the protection of American institutions, is an impertinence and a fraud upon its face. The preservation of our institutions depends upon our people, upon their good sense, upon our courts and Congress, and legislatures and press. That they may be preserved, all citizens of all classes and of all forms of religious belief must join hands in a common cause. Pestilent agitators may impede and embarrass our growth; they may desecrate the great cause of freedom which it is our hope to perpetuate; but to suppose for one instant that the proscription of eight millions of citizens, as honest, as patriotic, and as just in their dealings as any other citizens, is to contribute anything but disorder and heart-burning to the discussion of public topics, is a piece of folly which would scarcely seem to deserve refutation.

In the first place, what American institutions are imperilled? Surely not the liberty of the press, which has been considered from time immemorial the *sine quâ non* of public liberty? Certainly not trial by jury, that priceless gem in the coronet of Anglo-Saxon liberty without which freedom would be incomplete and insecure? No one pretends that the law is administered by corrupt hands, even when its administration happens to be committed to Roman Catholics. Religious liberty certainly is not threatened, except by the very organization that professes an especial guardianship of American rights and liberties. As to our common schools, true, there is an honest difference of opinion among our citizens as to the proper way of conducting them. But as the enormous majority of the people in every State is in favor of unsectarian public education, it is the height of absurdity to take that as the target for violence and oppression. When it is borne in mind that the Roman Catholics have spent millions and millions of money, for conscience' sake, in building schools that their children might not forget the faith of their fathers, —a faith which if persevered in makes them honest, truthful, loyal citizens,—does it not seem as wicked as it is senseless to talk of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

menace on the part of Catholics against that system? Thus far, certainly, they have received but little aid from the State; and their magnanimous bearing, added to the great hardship which the system has entailed upon them, viz., payment for that education which many of them conscientiously refuse to receive, should entitle them to the warmest admiration and respect.

But, it is said, the Catholics call the common schools "godless." If by this is meant that religion is not taught therein, surely the expression is not a misnomer. That institution in which reverence for and devotion to God is excluded may certainly be called "godless" without offence. But even if the Catholics were unanimous, as they are not, in condemning the public schools; even if they were the enemy of those schools, which they strenuously deny,—the fact still remains that an enormous majority of voters is against them; and it is difficult to see upon what ground any of them could reasonably hope that satisfaction would be given to their demands. In the mean while, so far from neglecting the education of the children who are to become useful citizens, they challenge competition; and even in secular instruction their methods have received, and are, as these lines are written, receiving, in New York city, the encomiums of our best and most patriotic people, who are willing to abandon religious opposition where a just tribute to honest merit is due.

It may be said, and it is in fact claimed, by members of this new order, that they do not intend an attack upon any religious order or body of our citizens; that their sole object is to keep alive American traditions, and thus to preserve American institutions from impending danger. It is only just to say that the platform of the American Protective Association in terms makes this explicit declaration:

> "We attack no man's religion so long as he does not attempt to make his religion an element of political power: we are in favor of preserving constitutional liberty and maintaining the government of the United States: we regard all religio-political organizations as the enemies of civil and religious liberty."

So far as we are informed, no citizen, Roman Catholic or Protestant, has any dissent to offer from any of these high-sounding and rather inane propositions. As well proclaim that honesty is the best policy, and that evil communications corrupt good manners. States are not made or unmade by sonorous commonplaces, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that, if the American Protective Association has really achieved the success claimed for it, it must have some other business capital than this nickel-plated furniture. If it has really defeated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roman Catholics when running for office, it must have contributed something more to the campaign than this innocuous literature. The soundness of the maxims enunciated commends itself quite as well to the average Catholic as to the average Protestant. They would not be likely to affect votes in any large degree where they were generally accepted and borne by the candidates of all parties on their transparencies.

The question then arises, What is there in the programme besides all this? The answer is readily found in the oath which the members of the order are bound to take and observe, if they are to enjoy the privileges and the honor of participating in the rites of the new society and the companionship of kindred souls within its limits: first, no member shall ever favor or aid the nomination, election, or appointment of a Roman Catholic to any political office; second, he shall never employ a Roman Catholic in any capacity if a Protestant may be obtained to render the service required. In other words, the preservation of our institutions must depend, in a great measure, upon the elimination from public life of Roman Catholics, however eminent and patriotic; while, at the same time, all Catholic servants, male or female, however honest, competent, and deserving, must be cut off from earning their livelihood; that is to say, in the latter case, provided Protestants equally competent may be secured. The question of wages is not mentioned, so that it must be left to the individual conscience to determine how largely that element shall enter into the problem. As the general acceptance of this rule of elimination would naturally raise Protestant wages and reduce Catholic wages, a case of conscience might arise where economy and devotion to American institutions were arrayed on opposite sides; in other words, where the employment of Protestant help is expensive and that of Catholic assistance cheap. The Revised Regulations will probably assist conscientious members, of a frugal mind, to reconcile thrift and piety.

The writer of these lines is quite conscious that he is chargeable, and perhaps justly, with treating what may seem a serious subject with something like contempt. But, he may ask, Is it possible in this, our dying century of marvellous development and progress, to believe that so wretched an attempt to draw dividing lines between two great bodies of a Christian people may succeed? Catholics and Protestants are living not only at peace but in friendly harmony. They mingle together without reference to their peculiar views of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faith, respecting, rather than tolerating, each other's creeds. They deal together, live together, intermarry, rejoice together, and mourn together when sorrow touches the homes of those they love. A generous emulation in good works is their only rivalry. A proud consciousness of their supremacy as a nation is the common ground upon which they love to stand. Almost for the first time in history, Charity goes about clad in no exclusive dress, but visits the poor and cheers the distressed without inquiring into the form of prayer in which the suffering soul speaks to Heaven and asks for aid. The barriers are breaking down that separated class from class and men from men. Just and equal laws, with benevolent neutrality, have encouraged every form of belief that made men more loyal and patriotic. And now, when the millennium of religious difference has come and stripped controversy of its bitterness, there arises mysteriously and treacherously a secret band that dares to ask the American people, in violation of its traditions and laws and constitution and history, in violation of honor and of gratitude for past service, to ostracise, disgrace, and turn into serfdom millions of native-born Americans whose sole offence is that they worship God as did the whole Christian world only three centuries ago. It may be amiss to treat these disturbers of the peace with contempt, for their powers for mischief may not be despicable; but what language would be too strong if an attempt were made duly to characterize this un-American, un-Christian, unmanly venture?

It may be expedient here to make and to answer the inquiry, What causes produce these results? Do these apparently sudden growths of intolerant fanaticism start into life fully fledged for mischief without any general and appreciable cause? Our answer is, No. There are causes, and they may be briefly stated.

1. An appeal to intolerance in religious belief, and to persecution of those who differ from us in opinion, strikes a responsive chord in the breast of many otherwise gentle and amiable men. No form of controversy is more inviting, no fashion of persecution more congenial. The persecutor for conscience' sake, or what he believes to be for conscience' sake, often deludes himself with the idea that he is serving God in the manner most acceptable to the Divinity and in some way benefiting his own soul.

2. In this country of ours, where one single form of religious faith is singled out for unfavorable discrimination, it happens that the votaries of that creed belong, with comparatively few exceptions,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to one nationality. The Irish Catholics outnumber all other Catholics in a very large proportion, and it is quite as much the hatred and jealousy of the Irish race that is at the bottom of these movements, as an insane fear of the spread of Popery.

Many of the Irish-Americans have come to the United States without the advantage of early education, and have therefore failed to secure that social recognition which carries with it so many and such substantial advantages; but the Irish race is strong, vigorous, able, and aggressive. It turns to politics as naturally as the Italian turns to art, or the German to metaphysics. The Irish are different from other immigrants in this, that they possess the language on their arrival and need not go through the hard probationary period of education in that respect. They are clannish, hard-working, and indomitable. Accustomed by tradition to the buffets of fortune, the blows that stagger other men are but caresses to them. They practically govern our great cities, where they congregate, impelled by their gregarious and social nature, and thereby naturally arouse political antagonism.

If the majority of Catholics were French or Germans, the prejudice nominally based wholly upon religious differences would be greatly reduced in extent and importance. It would be strange, indeed, if religious ostracism were practised against French Roman Catholics when we consider that the largest liberty of conscience and action has long been allowed in France to minority creeds: to such an extent that Protestant clergymen are actually salaried by the State.

3. The majority of Irishmen have hitherto acted with the Democratic party and have become identified with it and its success. An attack upon Irish-American citizens is therefore acceptable to many simply because it is, indirectly, an attack on the party with which such citizens generally act.

4. Protestants assert that Catholics must and ought of right to be bigoted and intolerant in matters of religious belief, and they cite general propositions excerpted—sometimes correctly and sometimes not—from Papal addresses or theological treatises to prove it. But history shows this, at least in more modern times, to be as false as to assume that Protestants must and ought of right to be liberal in matters of faith. The most that can be said upon this subject favorable to Protestantism is that all creeds and sects have equally resorted to persecution in order to establish their peculiar tenets. The Catholic Church had on her side the logic of the situation when she sought to restrain her disobedient children from perilous excursions into the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

domain of free-thought. The language of Judge Story, in commenting upon that clause of the Constitution which declares that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States, may appropriately be used here:

"The Catholic and the Protestant had alternately waged the most ferocious and unrelenting warfare on each other, and Protestantism itself, at the very moment that it was proclaiming the right of private judgment, prescribed boundaries to that right, beyond which if any one dared to pass, he must seal his rashness with the blood of martyrdom."

The persistence of calumnious and wicked reports against the Catholic Church is another cause that may be added to the above. It is strange, indeed, that the credulity of intelligent men should accept without challenge some of the most audacious fabrications that it is possible for the human mind to conceive. Nothing is too extravagant for belief, if it be directed against the Catholic Church and its hierarchy. What shall we say of such statements as those recently issued by the American Protective Association, and stated to be solemn declarations of Catholic prelates:

"We view with alarm the rapid spread of educated intelligence, knowing well that, wherever the people are intelligent, the priest and prince cannot hope to live on the labor of the masses whose brains have been fertilized with our holy catechism. That in order to restore the order of things that made the reign of Gregory VIII., of holy memory, so glorious, the people must not think; that is a privilege that belongs only to the Pope, who by divine right is the only person appointed by God to do the political and religious thinking of this world.

"We view with alarm the rapid diffusion of the English language. It stands before the world as the tongue which for 300 years has ever been opposed to our holy church, and those who speak it have been foremost in assailing the holy see," etc., etc., *ad nauseam.*

Of course, argument, denial, and prayers for the exercise of ordinary good faith are lost with those who believe such assertions, and yet they are openly made, loudly repeated, widely published by respectable journals, and form a staple food for controversy with many of our anti-Popery citizens.

One more suggestion may be repeated here which has recently been made in a number of THE FORUM, to account for the disfavor in which Catholics are held among certain classes of our citizens. The allegation is a startling one, and contains in itself such a tribute to the nobility and beauty of the ancient church that it is hardly conceivable that it correctly accounts in the slightest degree for such disfavor. "The work of the church" (meaning the Catholic Church) it is said, "lies largely among a poor, illiterate, and morally degraded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class, and *therefore* that church naturally shares in the odium of their faults"! If this be true, then indeed, so long as the church retains the slightest claim to a divine origin and a divine purpose, so long must that reproach be imputed to her. She is, it is true, and has always been, the church of the poor and the illiterate. She alone has preached the gospel to them. She alone has won their confidence, and she alone has sought—and often with triumphant success—to raise them from degradation to a higher standard. She has in this followed the example of her Master and Founder. His walks were among "the poor, the illiterate, and the morally degraded." His hands did not shrink from touching the leper, from blessing the sinner; they were raised to Heaven in favor of those who had no friends on earth. He sent His Apostles for the express purpose of doing that which, if we credit the statement which I have quoted, *brings odium upon the church!* Perhaps this may be so. Then, let her continue to earn that odium in the largest sense. The hatred which good works bring with them, and the contempt which humble charity may create, will not long endure, and certainly will not spread far among our people.

FREDERIC R. COUDERT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE RIOTOUS CAREER OF THE KNOW-NOTHINGS.

It is much to be regretted that no student of our history has yet seen fit to place before his countrymen as truthful and impartial a biography of political parties in the United States as it is possible for an honest man to write. To suppose that such a narrative would be dry and tedious is a mistake, for it would be the story of a great people made up of men from every civilized race and land, experimenting in self-government on a stupendous scale, and dealing with moral, social, financial, and industrial issues of the gravest importance. But the most readable part would be the account of the innumerable third parties: of the conditions of national life from which they sprang; of the high aims, or selfish purposes, or impracticable ends they sought to accomplish; of their triumphs; or, as has so often been the case, their quiet and ignominious disappearance. They have been the expressive features of our political life, and have reflected every gust of passion, every unreasonable prejudice, every ennobling purpose, every patriotic sentiment that has appealed strongly to the people. Sometimes the membership has been confined to a single section of our country, as was that of the Anti-Masonic party, which never spread beyond the New England belt of westward emigration. Sometimes they have had followers everywhere, as the Greenback party and the Populists of our own day. Sometimes their purpose has been accomplished, as was that of the Liberty party, the Free Soilers, and the Abolitionists. Sometimes their purposes, while never accomplished, have never been abandoned, and they have periodically appeared before the country seeking support. Such a one is that party which under many names and at many times has come forward as the defender of American institutions when endangered by the presence of foreigners.

It is safe to say that this dread of the naturalized citizen has never been wholly absent from our political life, and that its outbreaks have always followed periods remarkable for the great numbers of new-comers to our shores. The Irish risings, the French Revolution, the massacre in San Domingo and the establishment of the Negro Republic, drove to this country, during the last decade of the eigh-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teenth century, thousands upon thousands of Frenchmen and Irishmen, who, availing themselves of the liberal naturalization laws, became citizens, and entered political life in the land of their adoption. Those were the days when the franchise was most restricted: when property qualifications and religious qualifications were required of every man who cast a vote or held an office; when an elector must have a freehold estate or a specified amount of yearly income, or pay a certain annual rent; and when no one could be a governor, or a judge, or a member of the legislature, who was not a Christian or a member of a particular Protestant sect, and who did not believe in the Trinity, or the divine inspiration of the Testaments, and a future state of reward and punishment. Yet, in spite of these limitations, the sudden appearance in large numbers of naturalized citizens to whom the past history and traditions of the country were as nothing, and who eagerly supported the party bent on overthrowing the Federalists, aroused serious alarm for the safety of American institutions. Then for the first time fear was expressed that the founders of the Republic had been too liberal; that it was not safe to invest the new citizen so early in his career with all the rights of the native; and in 1798 the term of residence prior to naturalization was changed to fourteen years.

The Republicans, who secured control of affairs in 1801, repealed this law and reduced the term to five years, and a whole generation passed away without any further signs of hostility to the foreigner.

Yet this same party, which courted and invited the man from abroad, was no friend to the institutions he was supposed to have behind him, and again and again broke out into open hostility to them. It attempted to drive the common law of England from the courts; in three States it succeeded in forbidding any case, any decision, any law-book decided or made or written in England since the Revolution, to be cited or read in court; it expelled the mace from the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania because it was a symbol of monarchy; and it sent out to the States an amendment to the Federal Constitution which forbade a citizen of the United States to receive any title of nobility or honor, or accept any gift or office from an emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, under penalty of loss of citizenship. Had one more State approved the proposed amendment, it would have become law. Indeed, many persons thought it was law, and in school-books published as late as 1860 it may be seen at the end of the Constitution as Article Thirteen of the Amendments.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fortunately the period during which this feeling was strongest was that during which immigration was smallest. But with the end of the Napoleonic wars the tide again set strongly toward America; foreigners came to us at the rate of twenty thousand a year; and with their appearance the old spirit of Native Americanism revived,—a spirit which many new causes tended to intensify and embitter. Since the days of Washington and Adams the franchise had been greatly extended; religious qualifications had been removed; property qualifications had been abolished or reduced; the number of elective officers had been increased; the free-school system had been established; and the power of the naturalized citizens greatly enlarged, for they settled almost entirely in the cities, where they formed a class by themselves. Though naturalized, they were not Americanized. Our history, our principles, our welfare concerned them not. The Declaration of Independence, the Fourth of July, Bunker Hill, Evacuation Day, the Constitution—were events and days and instruments of which they knew nothing, and for which they cared nothing. They celebrated their own days, spoke their own language, cast a united vote in behalf of whichever party would buy it at the highest price; and—what was far more offensive—were all members of the Roman Catholic Church, which was looked on as a foreign institution.

The Episcopal Church in America had no connection with the Established Church of England. The Methodists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians looked up to no church-head resident beyond the sea. But every Roman Catholic—layman, priest, or bishop—was a member of a great church hierarchy whose ruler was a foreign prince claiming and exercising both spiritual and temporal jurisdiction. That a people who could not abide the common law of England, and had all but forbidden an American citizen to receive even a title of honor at the hands of a foreign ruler, should look with alarm on the rapid increase in the number of aliens strongly attached by birth, by language, and by religion to monarchical institutions, is not surprising. In their eyes this sudden and steady inflow of Catholics was not the work of hard times, but of a deliberate and well-planned purpose on the part of the Catholic powers to destroy the free institutions of America.

Many well-known events encouraged and strengthened this belief. The rise of the Holy Alliance; the hostility which it showed toward republican institutions; the eagerness with which it stamped out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular movements in Naples in 1820 and in Spain in 1822; the desire of the Catholic powers to reduce the revolted provinces of Spain on this continent; and especially the recent formation of the St. Leopold Foundation in Austria, and the revival of the Order of the Jesuits, were all cited as indisputable evidence of the hatred felt by foreign governments—and by foreign Roman Catholic governments in particular—for the principles of freedom and the rights of man. Did any one inquire the cause of this hostility, he was instantly referred to the lectures delivered in 1828 by Frederick Schlegel, a devout Roman Catholic, the profoundest of German scholars, the friend and adviser of Metternich, and Counsellor of Legation in the Austrian Cabinet. In the course of his lectures Schlegel labored to prove that Protestantism favored democracy, while Popery supported monarchy; that the political revolution to which European governments had so long been subjected from the popular desire for liberty were the natural results of the Reformation; and that the great nursery of these destructive principles—the revolutionary school for France, and Spain, and all of Europe—was North America; he left his hearers to draw the conclusion that democracy should be destroyed in America by establishing Catholic missions. When, therefore, at the conclusion of his lectures, the St. Leopold Foundation was organized in Austria and spread to Hungary, Italy, Piedmont, Savoy, and France, the charge was openly made that its purpose was to build up the power of Rome in the United States by encouraging the emigration of Roman Catholics from Europe, and by establishing missions in the various States.

To this, color was given by the appearance of Roman Catholic orders, churches, and institutions in places where within the memory of men then living all such things had been proscribed. Bishops, cathedrals, sisters of charity, sisters of mercy, convents, nunneries, colleges, schools, orphan-asylums, and newspapers devoted to the Church of Rome, were now to be seen in every great city which had been the recipient of foreign emigration. By such arguments, supported by visible signs of the presence of a church whose head was crowned and owed no allegiance to the United States, the Native-American spirit, which by 1830 was rising high against foreigners, became at the outset closely allied with an anti-Catholic feeling, and the two have never parted company.

The decade covered by the 'thirties is unique in our history. Fifty years of life at high pressure had brought the people to a state

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of excitement, of lawlessness, of mob-rule, such as had never before existed. Intolerance, turbulence, riot became the order of the day. Differences of opinion ceased to be respected. Appeals were made not to reason but to force; reforms, ideas, institutions that were not liked were attacked and put down by violence; and one of the least liked and first to be assaulted was the Church of Rome. In 1831 St. Mary's Church in Sheriff Street, New York, was robbed and burned by incendiaries. In 1833 Miss Rebecca Reed fled from the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Mass., and told such tales that when, in 1834, Sister Mary John escaped from the same institution in a dazed and hysterical condition, the people rose and gave the convent to the flames.

With these deeds of violence the anti-Catholic excitement seemed to go down. But that hostility to foreigners which went hand in hand with it grew stronger and spread wider year after year. The stream of immigrants that entered New York city every twelve-month would now seem small indeed, but it was then thought to be portentous. From 30,000 in 1830 the number grew steadily till it passed 60,000 in 1836. In the decade between 1830 and 1840 more than 500,000 were landed at New York alone, a number often greatly surpassed in our times by the arrivals in six months. But when it was asserted that one white person in every twenty was of foreign birth, then arrivals began to assume an alarming significance.

Hurrying westward, the new-comers moved into the Mississippi Valley and startled the men of the new States with the appearance of a population that could neither read, write, nor speak our language. In Cincinnati, by 1840, half the voters were of foreign birth. Twenty-eight per cent were Germans, sixteen per cent were English, and one per cent French or Italian. In Dubuque County, Iowa, the natives of one foreign nation cast one-third of all the votes given at local elections. In St. Louis and in New Orleans the influence of foreigners was felt still more, and from the men of the West now came the cry that they were being swamped by the dregs of Europe; that their institutions, their liberties, their property were at the mercy of voters steeped in the ignorance, the prejudices, the vices of the Old World. A demand was now made for a reform in the naturalization laws and the extension of the term of residence to twenty-one years. But both Whigs and Democrats, in their platforms and in the political tracts, indorsed the cause of the immigrant, and the question became, Shall a new party be founded or the old parties reformed? Here and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there, as at Germantown in 1837, at New York city, and in the District of Columbia, even during the campaign of 1840, symptoms of a new party movement were visible. But it was not until 1841 that the people of Louisiana called a State convention and founded the American Republican Party, or, as it soon came to be called, the Native-American Party. From that convention issued an address urging national organization for the protection of American principles and the exclusion of foreigners from office,—a piece of advice which found ready listeners, and at the next election in New Orleans a large part of the municipal ticket was carried by the American Republicans. At St. Louis, at Lexington, at Philadelphia, and at New York the interest in the movement grew daily, and was once more joined with anti-Catholicism. The principles of the new party were:

1. Extend the term of naturalization to twenty-one years.
2. Nominate no man to office who is not a native born.
3. Guard from corruption and abuse the proceedings necessary to obtain papers of naturalization.
4. Prevent the union of church and state.
5. Keep the Bible in the schools.
6. Resist the encroachment of a foreign civil and spiritual power upon the institutions of our country.

For the spread of these sentiments the naturalized citizens, the "patented citizens" as they now were called, were in large part responsible. No opportunity that could serve to remind the native of the presence of the unassimilated foreigner was suffered to go by unused. Laborers combined to force contractors to employ no Americans. Old-World vendettas were fought out in our streets, and Americans for the first time became familiar with such terms as "Orangemen," "Ribbonmen," "Corkonians," "Far-downs," and with such airs as "Croppies, Lie Down!" and "Boyne Water." Then were seen the harp of Ireland and the thistle of Scotland glittering on the uniform of troops enrolled by law among the citizen soldiery of the United States. Then were made those two demands of the Catholics for a share in the school funds, and for the exclusion of King James's Bible from the public schools. Then were seen at the polls "No Catholic Irish Ticket!"; and on the fences handbills headed "Irishmen! To your posts!"; "Catholics! Vote for Mr. Lott!"; "Irishmen and all Catholic voters!" or, in one instance, the cross, and under it the words "In union is our strength!"

In a community excited by reminders such as these, and by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foolish and intemperate appeals and abusive charges made by the press of both parties, some local incident was all that was needed to bring about the instant union of the natives, and this incident was furnished by the political leaders in New York. For years past the elections in that city had been closely contested by the Whigs and Democrats; and when, with the aid of the Irish vote, the Democrats won in 1843 and gave a large proportion of the patronage to citizens of foreign birth, both Whigs and Democrats bolted their party, joined with the feeble American Republicans, and in April, 1844, chose a native mayor and board of aldermen. Meantime the excitement in New York spread to New Jersey and to Philadelphia, where the efforts to organize a party produced the dreadful riots of May and July, during which many lives were lost, and many churches and buildings burned,—deeds which nothing but the coolness of the leaders prevented from being repeated in New York. In both cities the success of the Americans was due to a determination on the part of earnest and patriotic Democrats to punish their party. The punishment inflicted, they went back to their allegiance, elected a Democratic mayor of New York in 1845, and, after enabling the Americans to send six representatives to the Twenty-ninth Congress, so weakened the party by their desertion before 1846, that but one American Republican sat in the Thirtieth Congress, and he came from Pennsylvania. In 1847 such districts as still maintained an organization went through the form of sending delegates to a national convention which met at Pittsburg in February, and, after nominating a Vice-President, recommended Zachary Taylor for President. The campaign which followed served but to exhibit their weakness, and in the Thirty-first Congress not one American Republican found a seat.

For the moment the excitement seemed over. The great issues raised by the Mexican War; the attempt to extend slavery into the Territories; the split which the Wilmot Proviso produced in both the Whig and Democratic parties; the discovery of gold, and the rush to California; the Free-Soil movement, and the intense excitement which went before and followed the Compromise of 1850,—dwarfed all other issues. The result of that Compromise and the deaths of Clay and Webster in 1852, and the crushing defeat of Scott at the polls, laid the Whigs prostrate; and in their efforts to reorganize they called in the aid of what was left of the American Republicans, to whom a new series of events had given renewed life.

The political disturbances in Europe from 1848 to 1850, and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discovery of gold in California, once more turned the stream of emigration westward and poured such a volume of foreigners into the Eastern cities as had never been known. Almost as many now came in three years as had ever at any previous time arrived in ten years. From 1840 to 1850 the sum total of arrivals was 1,500,000. But in 1851, 600,000; in 1852, 380,000; and in 1853, 370,000 foreigners entered the United States. The old feeling of dread revived, and the natives once more joined the anti-Catholic party and some time, and somewhere in New York city, in 1852 founded a secret oath-bound association which spread over the country like wildfire.

The state of affairs was ripe for such a growth. In the first place, the fugitive-slave law, and the man-hunting, mobbing, and rioting it produced, had destroyed the Whig and badly injured the Democratic organizations, and had released thousands of voters from all allegiance to party. In the next place the anti-Catholic feeling had never been suffered to subside. The "awful disclosures" in 1845 concerning the imprisonment of Edward Wilson in a religious institution at Cincinnati; the founding of a "No-Popery" newspaper named "The North American Protestant" in 1846; the so-called disclosures and lectures on auricular confession, by Giustiniani,—did their work so thoroughly that from 1846 to 1852 many an aspirant for office was called on to purge himself of the accusation of hostility to Catholics. The charges made by the Democrats against Scott in 1852, that he had been an American Republican in 1841; that in 1840 he had taken part in the attempt made at the Astor House in New York to found a Native-American Party; and that neither in 1844 nor in 1848 had he been a friend of Catholics,—were among the most serious that his supporters had to answer, were the subject of elaborate pamphlets, and cost him the vote of many a Whig State. No task was found harder by the Democrats than to explain why New Hampshire, the native State of Pierce, would not amend her Constitution and admit Catholics to office.

In the next place the arrival of Father Gavazzi, an apostate Barnabite monk, marked the beginning of a new anti-Papal crusade. He described the priests as given to every form of low debauchery; he declared that sisters of charity were prostitutes the world over, and declared that parents who sent their daughters to a convent sent them to a brothel. Under his influence street-preaching was revived, and by 1854 there was no city of any importance but had an anti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Popery preacher holding forth from curbstones and barrel-tops. That those denounced should turn upon the traducer was no more than human, and a new era of mob violence opened—in Boston, in New York, in Pittsburg, in Cincinnati, in Louisville, in Baltimore—directly due to the anti-Popery preachers.

That nothing might be wanting to increase the excitement, the Papal Nuncio Mgr. Gaetano Bedini landed at New York in the autumn of 1853 and gave a new opportunity to Gavazzi to stir up hatred and strife. The apostate priest, putting himself at the head of the movement against Bedini, travelled the country over, making charges no rational man ever for a moment believed, and which were soon proved to be utterly false. But the people were in no frame of mind to be reasoned with; the priest was believed, and the Nuncio was insulted, abused, mobbed, burned in effigy, and threatened with assassination. As he travelled westward, the excitement grew more and more intense, and, when Cincinnati was reached, became so great that the militia were called out to keep order. A howling mob two thousand strong paraded the streets, carrying transparencies inscribed "No Priests! No Kings! No Popery!"; "Down with Bedini!"; and when, as they drew near the home of the Archbishop, the police attempted to interfere, a running fight began.

To the northward and eastward the agitation was carried on by a street-preacher who called himself the "Angel Gabriel." He began his career in the streets of Boston, holding forth against Popes, priests, nuns, and Catholics generally, and so excited a crowd that heard him one night in May, 1854, that it attacked the Irish settlement at Chelsea and the Bellingham Catholic Church, and set an example that was followed wherever he went. In June the Catholic church at Coburg was burned; on July 3 an armed mob attacked the Irish quarter of Manchester, N. H., and expelled a peaceful population. On July 4, the Catholic church at Dorchester was blown up by gunpowder, and on the 5th the "Angel Gabriel," by preaching, caused the sacking and destruction of the Catholic church at Bath. But the list is too long to complete. It is enough to know that such was the state of the public mind when "The Supreme Order of the Star-Spangled Banner" began its invisible, resistless, mysterious career. It was a network of local secret associations or councils, whose members were bound together by secret oaths, and recognized one another by signs, grips, and passwords. The councils of each State were arranged in four degrees, and over these degrees

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presided a Grand Council of the United States of North America, with its President, its Vice-President, Secretaries, Inside Sentinel, Outside Sentinel, and Chaplain. Every member of a council was required to be twenty-one years old, to believe in the existence of a God, and to obey without question the will of the Order. Highly organized, thoroughly in earnest, it did its work with a precision of movement and a concert of action hitherto unknown in American politics. Its nominations were made by secret conventions of dele, gates from the various lodges in the city or the district the candidate was to represent; they were generally of the best men irrespective of party, and were voted for by the members of the Order under penalty of expulsion. No public indorsement was ever made: but the result, when viewed the day after the election, left no doubt that a powerful secret body of voters was at work defeating the schemes and setting at naught the calculations of the politicians.

To the old party leaders the situation was embarrassing, and became most seriousw hen in 1854 the Kansas-Nebraska Bill split the Northern Whigs and sent those who opposed, not slavery, but slavery in the Territories (and who could not therefore join either the Democrats or Republicans), into the ranks of the new and secretly working party. The charm of mystery brought others, and in 1854 the accession of voters was believed to be 5,000 a week. With them went in that element which was at once the strength and the weakness of the party; for hundreds of thousands of the new-comers had no sympathy with the movement against the Catholics, and, after contributing to success at many an election, split off and formed a wing derided as the "Mountain Sweets."

At first all was harmony, and in 1854 the new Native-American party carried the elections in Massachusetts and Delaware, and in New York State secured some Congressmen and polled 122,282 votes. By this time the party had thrown off much of its secrecy. The name of the Order had been discovered. Its secret alphabet was known. It did not hesitate to indorse men and to put forth candidates of its own. The meeting-places of its councils were no longer concealed, and it had received from its opponents the popular name of Know-Nothings. It is said that the true name and purpose of the Order were known to none save those who reached the highest degree; and that, as members of the lower degrees, when questioned about their party, always answered, "I don't know," the nickname "Know-Nothings" was given it, and at once accepted. But its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

avowed purposes were well known, and in the Know-Nothing Almanacs of 1855 were declared to be—

"anti-Romanism, anti-Bedinism, anti-Papistalism, anti-Nunneryism, anti-Winking-Virginism, anti-Jesuitism. Know-Nothingism is for light, liberty, education, and absolute freedom of conscience, with a strong dash of devotion to one's native soil."

As described in more sober and responsible publications, the Know-Nothing was a man who opposed not Romanism, but political Romanism; who insisted that all church property of every sect should be taxed; and that no foreigner under any name,—bishop, pastor, rector, priest,—appointed by any foreign ecclesiastical authority, should have control of any property, church, or school in the United States; who demanded that no foreigner should hold office; that there should be a common-school system on strictly American principles; that no citizen of foreign birth should ever enjoy all the rights of those who were native-born; and that even children of foreigners born on the soil should not have full rights unless trained and educated in the common schools.

These were the principles which appealed to the South. That great section of our country was almost without a foreign-born population, was full of nativist feeling in its best form, and when, in 1854, the Whig party was wrecked by the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, the remnant of it in the South turned willingly to its Native Americans. So strengthened, the new party in the elections of 1855 secured the land-commissioner of Texas, the legislature and comptroller of Maryland, and all but carried the States of Virginia, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. In the North the triumph was complete, and the governors and legislatures of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, California, and Kentucky were Know-Nothings. That this victory in the North was largely due to a great uprising against Catholicism is beyond dispute. The demand for a part of the school-funds for the purpose of supporting Catholic schools; the vast accumulation of property by the Church, and the peculiar manner of holding it; the ease with which church legislation was secured; and the long controversy between Senator Brooks of New York and "John, Archbishop of the Province of New York," went far to arouse even the cool-minded. "Who gave John Hughes this title?"—it was asked; "Who was it that had so kindly marked out the 'Province of New York'?"—who but the Pope and "King of the States of the Church"?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and "Is not this just the course to make America another State of the Church?" As the time was one of intense political excitement over Kansas, over slavery, over the fugitive-slave law, over the attempt to secure Cuba, the elections were attended by Know-Nothing riots, in which life and property were destroyed. But it was an age of riot, and what was then done to Catholics and their churches was no more than many a Catholic had been doing for years past to Abolitionists and Free-Soilers, or than foreign-born citizens have in our day done to Chinamen.

The success at the elections in 1855 encouraged the Grand Council to prepare the Order to enter the Presidential campaign of 1856 as a national party. A secret meeting was accordingly held at Philadelphia in February, and there the first and only native platform of the Know-Nothings was adopted. Horace Greeley had described them as possessing about "as many elements of persistence as an anti-cholera or anti-potato-rot party would have," and the proceedings of that one convention proved that his description was correct. Into it had by this time been drawn men of every shade of opinion on every question of the day, and to frame such a platform as would satisfy these was hopeless. As presented by the Grand Council and adopted by the Convention, the platform declared the following principles:

3. Americans must rule America; and to this end native-born citizens should be selected for all State, Federal, and municipal offices of government employment in preference to all others.

5. No person should be selected for political station who recognizes any allegiance or obligation of any description to any foreign prince, potentate, or power.

6. The unqualified recognition and maintenance of the reserved rights of the several States . . . and to this end the non-interference by Congress with questions appertaining solely to the individual States.

7. The recognition of the right of native-born and naturalized citizens of the United States, permanently residing in any Territory thereof, to frame their constitution and laws.

9. A change in the laws of naturalization, making a continued residence of twenty-one years an indispensable requisite for citizenship.

10. Opposition to any union between church and state; no interference with religious faith or worship; and no test-oath for office.

12. The maintenance and enforcement of laws constitutionally enacted until said laws shall be repealed or declared null and void by judicial authority.

The third, seventh, and ninth planks were put in to please the old-time Native-Americans; the fifth and tenth were for the anti-Catholics; the sixth and twelfth, which related to the enforcement of the fugitive-slave law, were to satisfy the South; the seventh,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and a hearty condemnation of the President and the Kansas Bill, it was expected would win votes in the North. In reality it pleased no one, and after a short struggle fifty "North-American" delegates, from seven free States, quit the convention, which then nominated Millard Fillmore and Andrew Jackson Donelson. The Whigs, a few months later, indorsed the nominees. But it was too late: a wave of Republicanism was sweeping eastward from the Northwest, and in November, 1856, swept Know-Nothingism out of the North. In a popular vote of 4,053,967, the American party cast but 874,534; of 296 electors it secured but eight; and sent but twenty Representatives and five Senators to Congress. In 1858 it suffered still more, and to the Congress which met in December, 1859, not one Native-American came from any State north of the Potomac and the Ohio save Maryland. There it was still an Anti-Catholic party, and in Baltimore, drawing to itself all the ruffians, "plug-uglies" and "tigers," held the polls, and for three years gave such an exhibition of lawlessness as can be found in the history of no other city.

A lingering trace of the Know-Nothings is to be seen in the Constitutional party of 1860, and in those secret, oath-bound Ku-Klux-Klan and White-Cap organizations which have terrorized the South since reconstruction days. But it has been reserved for the present to witness a true revival of the American Protestant Association of 1840 in the American Protective Association of 1894, with the secret methods of the Know-Nothings thrown in. Never was the name "American" more misapplied. Such parties and such methods are wholly foreign. They belong to the days of the Inquisition, the Star Chamber, the Bastille, and the poisoned flower; not to the close of the nineteenth century in America.

JOHN BACH MCMASTER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CARLYLE'S PLACE IN LITERATURE.

It is now about half a century that the world has had all that is most masterly in the work of Thomas Carlyle. And a time has arrived when we may very fairly seek to weigh the sum total of influence which he left on his own and on subsequent generations. We are now far enough off, neither to be dazzled by his eloquence nor irritated by his eccentricities. The men whom he derided, and who shook their heads at him, are gone: fresh problems, new hopes, other heroes and prophets whom he knew not, have arisen. Our world is in no sense his world. And it has become a very fair question to ask—What is the residuum of permanent effect from these great books of his, which have been permeating English thought for half a century and more?

It is a rare honour for any writer—at least for one who is neither poet nor novelist—to have his productions live beyond two generations, and to continue to be a great literary force, when fifty years have altered all the conditions in which he wrote and the purposes and ideas which he treated. It cannot be said that Carlyle's effective influence is less now than it was a generation ago. It has lived through the Utilitarian and Evolution movements and has not been extinguished by them. And Thomas Carlyle bids fair to enter into that sacred band whose names outlive their own century and give some special tone to their national literature.

The survival of certain books and names from generation to generation does not depend on merit alone. Boswell's "Life of Johnson" is immortal: though we do not rank "Bozzy" as a hero or a genius. Hume's "History of England" is a classic; though it can hardly be said to be a good book. Few books have ever exercised so amazing an influence as Rousseau's "Social Contract"; yet the loosest mind of to-day can perceive its sophistry. Burke's diatribes on the French Revolution affected the history of Europe; though no one denies that they were inspired by passion and deformed by panic. Hobbes has very few readers to-day; but the "Leviathan" may last as long as More's "Utopia," which has hardly more readers in our age. Books

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which exert a paramount influence over their contemporaries may die down and be known only in the history of literature. And books, again, of very moderate value, written by men of one-sided intellect or founded on utterly rotten theories, may, by virtue of some special quality, or as meeting some definite purpose, attain to a high and permanent place in the world of letters. Many a great book ceases very early to command readers: and many books continue to be read which are far from great.

The first question that arises is this:—Do the chief works of Carlyle belong to that class of books which attain an enduring and increasing power, or to that class which effect great things for one or two generations and then become practically obsolete? It would not be safe to put his masterpieces in any exclusive sense into either of these categories; but we may infer that they will ultimately tend to the second class rather than the first. Books which attain to an enduring and increasing power are such books as the "Ethics," the "Politics," and the "Republic," the "Thoughts" of Marcus Aurelius and of Vauvenargues, the "Essays" of Bacon and of Hume, Plutarch's "Lives" and Gibbon's "Rome." In these we have a mass of pregnant and ever fertile thought in a form that is perennially luminous and inspiring. It can hardly be said that even the masterpieces of Carlyle—no! not the "Revolution," "Cromwell," or the "Heroes"—reach this point of immortal wisdom clothed with consummate art. The "personal equation" of Teufelsdröckhian humour, its whimsies and conundrums, its wild outbursts of hate and scorn, not a few false judgments, and perverse likes and dislikes—all this is too common and too glaring to permit its master to pass into the portals where dwell the wise, serene, just, and immortal spirits. Not of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.

On the other hand, if these masterpieces of sixty years ago are not quite amongst the great books of the world, it is preposterous to regard them as obsolete, or such as now interest only the historian of literature. They are read to-day practically as much as ever, and are certain to be read for a generation or two to come. But they are not read to-day with the passionate delight in the wonderful originality, nor have they the commanding authority they seemed to possess for the faithful disciples of the 'forties and the 'fifties. Nor can any one suppose that the next century will continue to read them, except with an open and unbiassed mind, and a willingness to admit that even here there is much dead wood, gross error, and pitiable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exaggeration. When we begin to read in that spirit, however splendid be the imagination, and however keen the logic, we are no longer under the spell of a master: we are reading a memorable book, with a primary desire to learn how former generations looked upon things.

Thomas Carlyle, like all other voluminous writers, wrote very much that cannot be called equal to his best: and it cannot be denied that the inferior pieces hold a rather large proportion of the whole. Nothing is less fatal to true criticism than the popular habit of blindly overvaluing the inferior work of men of genius, unless it be the habit of undervaluing them by looking at this instead of at their best. Great men are to be judged by their highest; and it is not of very great consequence if this highest forms a moderate part of the total product. Now, what are the masterpieces of Thomas Carlyle? In the order of their production they are "Sartor Resartus," 1831; "French Revolution," 1837; "Hero-Worship," 1840; "Past and Present," 1843; "Cromwell," 1845. We need not be alarmed, if this list forms but a third of the thirty volumes (not including translations); and if it omits such potent outbursts as "Chartism," 1839, and "Latter-Day Pamphlets," 1850, or such a wonderful piece of history as "Friedrich the Second," 1858–1865. "Chartism," and the "Latter-Day Pamphlets" are full of eloquence, insight, indignation, and pity, and they exerted a great and wholesome effect on the generation whom they smote as with the rebuke and warning of a prophet. But, as we look back on them after forty or fifty years of experience, we find in them too much of passionate exaggeration, at times a ferocious wrong-headedness, and everywhere so utter an absence of practical guidance or fruitful suggestion, that we cannot reckon these magnificent Jeremiads as permanent masterpieces.

As to "Friedrich," it is not a book at all, but an encyclopædia of German biographies in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Who reads every word of these ten volumes? Who cares to know how big was the belly of some court chamberlain, or who were the lovers of some unendurable Frau? What a welter of dull garbage! In what dustheaps dost thou not smother us, Teufelsdröckh! O Thomas, Thomas, what Titania has bewitched thee with the head of Dryasdust on thy noble shoulders? Compare "Friedrich" with "Cromwell." In the Life of the Puritan hero, we have a great purpose, a prolonged homily, a magnificent appeal against an unjust

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentence passed two hundred years before by ignorance, bigotry, and passion. The literary interest never overpowers the social and political, the moral and the religious purpose. Twenty years later, the literary interest overpowers the historical. Half of the ten volumes of "Friedrich" are taken up with tiresome anecdotes about the ordinary appendages of a German court. Even the true greatness of Frederick—his organization of a model civil administration—is completely obscured in the deluge of court gossip and *Potsdamiana*. "Friedrich" is a wonderful work, highly valuable to the student, a memorable result of Teufelsdröckhian industry and humour—but it is not a masterpiece: judged by the standard of Carlyle's own masterpieces, it is a failure. "Cromwell" is the Life of a hero and a statesman: "Friedrich" is Memoirs of the court and camp of the greatest of modern rulers.

On the whole, we may count the "Cromwell" as the greatest of Carlyle's effective products. With his own right hand alone and by a single stroke, he completely reversed the judgment of the English nation about their greatest man. The whole weight of Church, Monarchy, aristocracy, fashion, literature and wit, had for two centuries combined to falsify history and distort the character of the noblest of English statesmen. And a simple man of letters, by one book, at once and forever reversed this sentence, silenced the allied forces of calumny and rancour, and placed Oliver for all future time as the greatest hero of the Protestant movement. There are few examples in the history of literature of so great and so sudden a triumph of truth and justice. At the same time, it is well to remember that the "Cromwell" is not a literary masterpiece, in the sense of being an organic work of high art. It is not the 'Life' of Cromwell: it was not so designed, and was never so worked out. It is his 'Letters and Speeches,' illustrated by notes. A work so planned cannot possibly be a work of art, or a perfect piece of biography. The constant passage from text to commentary, from small print to large, from Oliver's Puritan sermonizing to Carlyle's Sartorian eccentricities, destroys the artistic harmony of the book as an organic work of art. The 'Life' of Cromwell was in fact never written by Carlyle: and has yet to be written. Never yet was such splendid material for a 'Life' prepared by a great historian.

"Sartor Resartus" (1831), the earliest of his greater works, is unquestionably the most original, the most characteristic, the deepest and most lyrical of his productions. Here is the Sage of Craigenput-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

took at his best, at his grimmest, and, we must add, in his most incoherent mood. To make men think, to rouse men out of the slough of the conventional, the sensual, the mechanical, to make men feel, by sheer force of poetry, pathos, and humour, the religious mystery of life and the "wretchlessness of unclean living"—(as our Church article hath it)—nothing could be more trumpet-tongued than "Sartor." The Gospel according to Teufelsdröckh is, however, a somewhat Apocalyptic dispensation: and few there be who can "rehearse the articles of his belief" with anything like precision. Another and a more serious difficulty is this. How many a "general reader" steadily reads through "Sartor" from cover to cover? And of such, how many entirely understand the inner Philosophy of Clothes, and follow all the allusions, quips, and nicknames of Sartorian subjectivity. It would be a fine subject for some Chautauqua Circle of readers to write examination papers upon all the inward musings of Teufelsdröckh. The first class of successful candidates, one fears, would be small. A book—not of science or of pure philosophy, or any technical art whatever—but a book addressed to the general reader, and designed for the education of the public, and which can be intelligently digested and assimilated by so very few of the public, can hardly be counted as an unqualified success.

The "French Revolution," however, is far more distinctly a work of art than "Cromwell," and far more accessible to the great public than "Sartor." Indeed the "French Revolution" is usually, and very properly, spoken of and thought of as a prose poem, if prose poem there can be. It has the essential character of an epic, short of rhythm and versification. Its 'argument' and its 'books'; its contrasts and 'episodes'; its grouping of characters and denouement—are as carefully elaborated as the "Gerusalemme" of Tasso, or the "Æneid" of Virgil. And it produces on the mind the effect of a poem with an epic or dramatic plot. It is only a reader thoroughly at home in the history of the time, who can resist the poet's spell when, at the end of Part iii., Book vii., he is told that the Revolution is 'ended,' and the curtain falls. 13, *Vendémiaire, An. 4*, (October 5, 1795) is merely a casual point in a long movement, at which the poet finds it artistic to stop. But the French Revolution does not stop there, nor did the "Whiff of Grapeshot" end it in any but an arbitrary sense. When the poet tells us that, upon Napoleon's defeating the Sections around the Convention, "the hour had come and the Man," and that the thing called the French Revolution was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thereby "blown into space," nothing more silly, mendacious, and 'phantasmic' was ever stated by sober historian. The Convention was itself the living embodiment and product of the Revolution, and Bonaparte's smart feat in protecting it, increased its authority and confidence. If Carlyle's "French Revolution" be real history, it lands us in as futile a *non sequitur* as ever historian committed.

Viewed as an historical poem, the "French Revolution" is a splendid creation. Its passion, energy, colour, and vast prodigality of ineffaceable pictures, place it undoubtedly at the head of all the pictorial histories of modern times. And the dramatic rapidity of its action, and the inexhaustible contrasts of its scenes and tableaux —things which so fatally pervert its truthfulness as authentic history —immensely heighten the effect of the poem on the reader's mind. Not that Carlyle was capable of deliberately manufacturing a historical romance in the mendacious way of Thiers and Lamartine. But, having resolved to cast the story of 1789 and the few years before and after it into a dramatic poem, he inevitably, and no doubt unconsciously, treated certain incidents and certain men with a poet's license or with a distorted vision. This too is more apparent toward the close of his work, when he begins to show signs of fatigue and exhaustion. At the same time, there are large parts of his work which are as true historically, as they are poetically brilliant. Part I.—'The Bastille'—is almost perfect. The whole description of Versailles, its court, and government, of the effervescence of Paris—from the death of Louis XV. to the capture of Versailles—is both powerful and true. Part II.—'The Constitution'—is the weakest part of the whole from the point of view of accurate history. And Part III.—'The Terror'—is only trustworthy in separate pictures and episodes, however splendid its dramatic power.

It would need an essay, or rather a volume, on the French Revolution to enumerate all the wrong judgments and fallacies of Carlyle's book, if we bring it to the bar of sober and authentic history. First and foremost comes his fundamental misconception that the Revolution was an anarchical outburst against corruption and oppression, instead of being, as it was, the systematic foundation of a new order of society. Again, he takes it to be a purely French, local, and political movement, instead of seeing that it was an European, social, spiritual movement toward a more humane civilization. And next, he regards the Revolution as taking place in the six years between the taking of the Bastille and the defeat of the Sections by Bonaparte;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whereas the Revolution was preparing from the time of Louis XIV., and is not yet ended in the time of President Carnot. Next to the capital mistake of misconceiving the entire character and result of the Revolution, comes the insolence which treats the public men of France during a whole generation as mere subjects for ribaldry and caricature. From this uniform mockery, Mirabeau and Bonaparte, two of the least worthy of them, are almost alone exempted. This is a blunder in art, as well as a moral and historical offence. Men like Condorcet, Danton, Hoche, Carnot, not to name a score of other old Conventionels, soldiers, and leaders, were pure, enlightened, and valorous patriots—with a breadth of soul and social sympathies and hopes that tower far above the insular prejudices and Hebrew traditions of a Scotch Cameronian *littérateur*—poet, genius, and moralist though he also was himself.

But, though the "French Revolution" is not to be accepted as historical authority, it is profoundly stimulating and instructive, when we look on it as a lyrical apologue. It is an historical phantasmagoria—which, though hardly more literally true than Aristophanes's "Knights" or "Clouds," may almost be placed beside these immortal satires for its imagination, wisdom, and insight. The personages and the events of the French Revolution in fact succeeded each other with such startling rapidity and such bewildering variety, that it is difficult for any but the most patient student to keep the men and the phases steadily before the eye without confusion and in distinct form. This Carlyle has done far better than any other historian of the period, perhaps even better than any historian whatever. That so many Englishmen are more familiar with the scenes and the men and women of the French Revolution than they are with the scenes and the men and women of their own history, is very largely the work of Carlyle. And as to the vices and weakness of the Old Régime, the electric contagion of the people of Paris, the indomitable elasticity of the French spirit, the magnetic power of the French genius, the famous *furia francese*, and the terrible rage into which it can be lashed—all this Carlyle has told with a truth and insight that has not been surpassed by any modern historian.

It being then clearly understood that Carlyle did not leave us the trustworthy history of the French Revolution, in the way in which Thucydides gave us the authentic annals of the Peloponnesian war, or Cæsar the official dispatches on the Conquest of Gaul, we must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

willingly admit that Carlyle's history is one of the most fruitful products of the nineteenth century. No one else certainly has written the authentic story of the French Revolution at large, or of more than certain aspects and incidents of it. In spite of misconceptions, and such mistaken estimates as those of Mirabeau and Bonaparte, such insolent mockery of good and able men, such ridiculous caricatures as that of the 'Feast of Pikes' and the trial of the King, such ribald horse-play as 'Grilled Herrings' and 'Lion Sprawling,' in spite of blots and blunders in every chapter—the "French Revolution" is destined to live long and to stand forth to posterity as the typical work of the master. It cannot be said to have done such work as the "Cromwell"; for it is far less true and sound as history, and it is only one out of scores of interpreters of the Revolution, whereas in the "Cromwell" Carlyle worked single-handed. But being far more organic, far more imaginative, indeed more powerful than the "Cromwell" in literary art, the "French Revolution"—produced, we may remember, exactly in the middle of the author's life—will remain the enduring monument of Carlyle's great spirit and splendid brain.

The book entitled "Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History" (1840), to give it its full and original title, comes next in order of time, and perhaps of abiding value. It is a book rather difficult for us now to estimate after more than half a century, for so very much has been done in the interval to build upon these foundations, to enlarge our knowledge of these very heroes, and the estimates of Carlyle in the first half of this century are for the most part so completely the commonplaces of the English-speaking world at the close of the century, that when we open the "Heroes" again it is apt to seem obvious, *connu*, the emphatic assertion of truisms that no one disputes. How infinitely better do we now, in 1894, know Dante and Shakespeare, Cromwell and Napoleon, than did our grandfathers in 1840! Who, nowadays, imagines Mahomet to have been an impostor, or Burns to have been a mere tipsy song-writer? What a literature has the last half-century given us on Dante, on Islam and its spirit, on Rousseau, on Burns, on the English and the French revolutions! But in 1840 the true nature of these men was very faintly understood. Few people but soldiers had the least chance of being called 'heroes,' and the 'heroic in history' was certainly not thought to include either poets, preachers, or men of letters. "Heroes and Hero-Worship," like the "Cromwell," has, in fact, done its work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so completely that we find it a little too familiar to need any constant reading or careful study.

To judge fairly all that Carlyle effected by his book on Heroes we must put ourselves at the point of view of the time, the days of Wellington and Melbourne, Brougham and Macaulay, Southey and Coleridge. None of these men understood the heroic in Norse mythology, or the grandeur of Oliver Cromwell, or the supreme importance of the "Divina Commedia" as the embodiment of Catholic Feudalism. All this Carlyle felt as no Englishman before him had felt, and told us in a voice which has since been accepted as conclusive. How far deeper is the view of Carlyle about such a familiar personality as Johnson than is that of Macaulay, how much farther does Carlyle see into the Shakespearian firmament than even Coleridge! How far better does he understand Rousseau and Burns than did Southey, laureate and critic as he was hailed in his time. The book is a collection of Lectures, and we now know how entirely Carlyle loathed that kind of utterance, how much he felt the restraints and limits it involved. And for that reason, the book is the simplest and most easily legible of his works, with the least of his mannerism and the largest concessions to the written language of sublunary mortals. Nearly all the judgments he passes are not only sound, but now almost universally accepted. To deal with the heroic in history, he needed, as he said, six months rather than six days. It was intended, he told his hearers, "to break ground," to clear up misunderstandings. It has done this: and a rich crop has resulted from his ploughshare.

Nothing but a few sketches could be compressed into six hours. But it is curious how many things seem omitted in this survey of the heroic. At the age of forty-five Carlyle had not recognized Friedrich at all, for he does not figure in the 'Hero as King.' Napoleon takes his place, though Bonaparte was a "hero" only in the bad sense of hero which Carlyle was seeking to explode. It is well that, since he finished the "French Revolution," Carlyle seems to have found out that Bonaparte "parted with Reality," and had become a charlatan, a sham. Still for all that, he remains "our last great man." Mazzini was present and heard these lectures: and when he had listened to this last, he went up to Carlyle and told him that he had undone his Hero-worship and had fallen from the truth; and from that hour Mazzini would hold no terms with the gospel of One-Man. To make Hero-worship close with the installation of Napoleon as "our last

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great man," was to expose the inherent weakness of the Sartorian creed—that humanity exists for the sake of its great men. The other strange delusion is the entire omission from the 'Hero as Priest' of any Catholic hero. Not only are St. Bernard and St. Francis, Becket and Lanfranc—all the martyrs and missionaries of Catholicism—consigned to oblivion:—but not a word is said of Alfred, Godfrey, St. Louis, St. Ferdinand, and St. Stephen. In a single volume there must be selection of types. But the whole idea of Hero-Worship was perverted in a plan which had no room for a single Catholic type.

This perverse exaggeration of Puritan religion, and the still more unjust hatred of Catholic religion, unfortunately runs through all Carlyle's work, and perhaps nowhere breaks out in so repulsive a form as in the piece called 'Jesuitism' (1850), in the "Latter Day Pamphlets" (No. viii.) Discarding the creed, the practice, and the language of Puritanism, Carlyle still retained its narrowness, its self-righteousness, its intolerance, and its savagery. The moralist, to whom John Knox was a hero, but St. Bernard was not, but only a follower of the "three-hatted Papa," and an apostle of "Pig's-wash," was hardly the man to exhaust the heroic in history. In the 'Hero as Man-of-Letters,' Carlyle was at home. If ever pure letters produced a hero, the Sage of Chelsea was one. With Johnson, with Rousseau, he is perfectly rational, and the mass of literature which has accumulated round the names of these two, only tends to confirm the essential justice of Carlyle's estimate. Nor need we dispute his estimate of the vigour and manliness of Burns. It is only when Carlyle describes him as "the most gifted British soul" in the eighteenth century—the century of Hume, Adam Smith, Fielding and Goldsmith—that we begin to smile. Burns was a noble-hearted fellow, as well as a born poet. But perhaps the whole cycle of Sartorian extravaganza contains no saying so futile as the complaint that the British nation in the great war with France entrusted their destinies to a phantasmic Pitt, instead of to "the Thunder-god, Robert Burns." Napoleon would no doubt have welcomed such a change of ministry. It is incoherences of this sort which undo so much of the splendid service that Carlyle gave to his age.

But we are not willing to let the defects of Carlyle's philosophy drive out of mind the permanent and beautiful things in his literary work. "Past and Present" (1843) is certainly a success—a happy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and true thought, full of originality, worked out with art and power. The idea of embedding a living and pathetic picture of monastic life in the twelfth century, and a minute study of the labours of enlightened churchmen in the early struggles of civilization—the idea of embedding this tale, as if it were the remains of some disinterred saint, in the midst of a series of essays on the vices and weaknesses of modern society—was a highly original and instructive device, only to be worked to success by a master. And the master brought it to a delightful success. In all his writings of thirty volumes there are few pages more attractive than the story of Jocelin of Brakelond, Abbot Hugo, Abbot Samson, and the festival of St. Edmund, which all pass away as in a vision leaving "a mutilated black ruin amidst green expanses"—as we so often see in our England to-day after the trampling of seven centuries over the graves of the early monks.

And then, when the preacher passes suddenly from the twelfth century to the nineteenth, from toiling and ascetic monks to cotton spinners and platform orators—the effect is electric—as though some old Benedictine rose from the dead and began to preach in the crowded streets of a city of factories. Have we yet, after fifty years in this time of tepid hankering after Socialism and Theophilanthropic experiments, got much further than Thomas Carlyle in his preaching in Book IV. on 'Aristocracies,' 'Captains of Industry,' 'The Landed,' 'The Gifted'? What truth, what force in the aphorism:—"To predict the Future, to manage the Present, would not be so impossible, had not the Past been so sacrilegiously mishandled; effaced, and what is worse, defaced"!—"Of all Bibles, the frightfulest to disbelieve in is this 'Bible of Universal History'"—"The Leaders of Industry, if Industry is ever to be led, are virtually the Captains of the World." What new meaning that phrase has acquired in these fifty years! "Men of letters may become a 'chivalry,' an actual instead of a virtual Priesthood." Well! not men of letters, exactly: but perhaps philosophers, with an adequate moral, and scientific training. Here, as so often, Carlyle just missed a grand truth to which his insight and nobility of soul had led him, through his perverse inability to accept any systematic philosophy, and through his habit to listen to the whispering of his own heart as if it were equivalent to scientific certainty. But the whole book, "Past and Present," is a splendid piece and has done much to mould the thought of our time. It would impress us much more than it does, were it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not become the very basis of all sincere thought about social problems and the future conditions of industry.

Of the "Cromwell's Letters and Speeches" (1845) we have already spoken, as the greatest of our author's effective products, inasmuch as it produced the most definite practical result in moulding opinion, and a result of the highest importance. But it is not, as we have seen, a work of art, or even an organic work at all, and it cannot compare in literary charm with some other of the author's works. We do not turn to the "Cromwell" again and again, as we do to the "French Revolution," or to "Sartor," which we can take up from time to time as we do a poem or a romance. Many of the great books of the world are not read and reread by the public, just as no one but special students continually resort to the "Novum Organum," or the "Wealth of Nations." For similar reasons, the "Cromwell" will never be a favorite book with the next century, as it cannot be said to have been with ours. It has done its work with masterly power; and its work will endure. And some day perhaps, from out these materials, and those collected by Mr. Gardiner, and by οἱ περὶ Gardiner, a 'Life of Cromwell' may be finally composed.

It is true that the attempt to force Oliver upon us as perfect saint and infallible hero is irritating and sometimes laughable; it is true that the anxiety to bedwarf every one but Cromwell himself is unjust and untrue; and the depreciation of every man who declines to play into Oliver's hands is too often manifest. But, on the whole, the judgments are so sound, the supporting authorities are so overwhelming, the work of verification is so thorough, so scrupulous, so perfectly borne out by all subsequent research—that the future will no doubt look on the "Cromwell," not only as the most extraordinary, but the most satisfactory and effective of all Carlyle's work; although, for the reasons stated, it can never have the largest measure of his literary charm or possess the full afflatus of his poetic and mystical genius.

By the time that "Cromwell" was published, Thomas Carlyle was turned of fifty, and had produced nearly two-thirds of his total work. It may be doubted if any later book will be permanently counted amongst his masterpieces. "Friedrich," for reasons set forth, was an attempt in late life to repeat the feat of the "Cromwell": it was a much less urgent task: and it was not so well performed. The "Latter-Day Pamphlets" (1850) add not much that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is new to "Past and Present" (1843), or to "Sartor" (1831); and little of what they add is either needful or true. The world had been fully enlightened about Wind-bags, Shams, the approach to Tophet, Stump-Orators, Palaver-Parliaments, Phantasm-Captains, and the rest of the Sartorian puppet-pantomime. There was a profound truth in all of these invectives, warnings, and prophecies. But the prophet's voice at last got so shrieky and monotonous, that, instead of warning and inspiring a second generation, these terrific maledictions began to fall upon a practical world. An ardent admirer of the prophet has said that, when he first heard Carlyle speak face to face, he could hardly resist the impression that he was listening to an actor personating the Sage of Chelsea, and mimicking the stock phrases of the "Latter-Day Pamphlets." Certainly no man of sense can find any serious guidance on any definite social problem from these "Pamphlets" of his morbid decline. Carlyle at last sat eating his heart out, like Napoleon on St. Helena. His true friends will draw a covering over the latest melancholy outbursts about Negroes, Reformers, Jamaica massacres, and the anticipated conflagration of Paris by the Germans. It is pitiful indeed to find in "the collected and revised works," thirty-six volumes, the drivel of his Pro-Slavery advocacy, and ill-conditioned snarling at honest men labouring to reform ancient abuses.

It is perilous for any man, however consummate be his genius, to place himself on a solitary rock apart from all living men and defiant of all before him, as the sole source of truth out of his own inner consciousness. It is fatal to any man, however noble his own spirit, to look upon this earth as "one fuliginous dust-heap," and the whole human race as a mere herd of swine rushing violently down a steep place into the sea. Nor can the guidance of mankind be with safety entrusted to one who for eighty-six years insisted on remaining an omnivorous reader and omnigenous writer of books. Carlyle was a true and pure "man of letters," looking at things and speaking to men, alone, in his study through the medium of printed paper. All that a "man of letters," of great genius and lofty spirit, could do by mere printed paper, he did. And as the "supreme man of letters" of his time he will ever be honoured and long continue to be read. He deliberately cultivated a form of speech which made him unintelligible to all non-English-speaking readers, and intelligible only to a select and cultivated body even amongst them. He wrote in what, for practical purposes, is a local, or rather personal, dialect. And

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thus he deprived himself of that world-wide and European influence which belongs to such men as Hume, Gibbon, Scott, Byron, Dickens, —even to Macaulay, Ruskin, and Spencer. But his name will stand beside theirs in the history of British thought in the nineteenth century; and a devoted band of chosen readers, wherever the Anglo-Saxon tongue is heard, will for generations to come continue to drink inspiration from the two or three masterpieces of the Annandale peasant-poet.

FREDERIC HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MANLY VIRTUES AND PRACTICAL POLITICS.

SOMETIMES, in addressing men who sincerely desire the betterment of our public affairs, but who have not taken active part in directing them, I feel tempted to tell them that there are two gospels which should be preached to every reformer. The first is the gospel of morality; the second is the gospel of efficiency.

To decent, upright citizens it is hardly necessary to preach the doctrine of morality as applied to the affairs of public life. It is an even graver offence to sin against the commonwealth than to sin against an individual. The man who debauches our public life, whether by malversation of funds in office, by the actual bribery of voters or of legislators, or by the corrupt use of the offices as spoils wherewith to reward the unworthy and the vicious for their noxious and interested activity in the baser walks of political life,—this man is a greater foe to our well-being as a nation than is even the defaulting cashier of a bank, or the betrayer of a private trust. No amount of intelligence and no amount of energy will save a nation which is not honest, and no government can ever be a permanent success if administered in accordance with base ideals. The first requisite in the citizen who wishes to share the work of our public life, whether he wishes himself to hold office or merely to do his plain duty as an American by taking part in the management of our political machinery, is that he shall act disinterestedly and with a sincere purpose to serve the whole commonwealth.

But disinterestedness and honesty and unselfish desire to do what is right are not enough in themselves. A man must not only be disinterested, but he must be efficient. If he goes into politics he must go into practical politics, in order to make his influence felt. Practical politics must not be construed to mean dirty politics. On the contrary, in the long run the politics of fraud and treachery and foulness is unpractical politics, and the most practical of all politicians is the politician who is clean and decent and upright. But a man who goes into the actual battles of the political world must prepare himself much as he would for the struggle in any other branch of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our life. He must be prepared to meet men of far lower ideas than his own, and to face things, not as he would wish them, but as they are. He must not lose his own high ideal, and yet he must face the fact that the majority of the men with whom he must work have lower ideals. He must stand firmly for what he believes, and yet he must realize that political action, to be effective, must be the joint action of many men, and that he must sacrifice somewhat of his own opinions to those of his associates if he ever hopes to see his desires take practical shape.

The prime thing that every man who takes an interest in politics should remember is that he must act, and not merely criticise the actions of others. It is not the man who sits by his fireside reading his evening paper, and saying how bad our politics and politicians are, who will ever do anything to save us; it is the man who goes out into the rough hurly-burly of the caucus, the primary, and the political meeting, and there faces his fellows on equal terms. The real service is rendered, not by the critic who stands aloof from the contest, but by the man who enters into it and bears his part as a man should, undeterred by the blood and the sweat. It is a pleasant but a dangerous thing to associate merely with cultivated, refined men of high ideals and sincere purpose to do right, and to think that one has done all one's duty by discussing politics with such associates. It is a good thing to meet men of this stamp; indeed it is a necessary thing, for we thereby brighten our ideals, and keep in touch with the people who are unselfish in their purposes; but if we associate with such men exclusively we can accomplish nothing. The actual battle must be fought out on other and less pleasant fields. The actual advance must be made in the field of practical politics among the men who represent or guide or control the mass of the voters, the men who are sometimes rough and coarse, who sometimes have lower ideals than they should, but who are capable, masterful, and efficient. It is only by mingling on equal terms with such men, by showing them that one is able to give and to receive heavy punishment without flinching, and that one can master the details of political management as well as they can, that it is possible for a man to establish a standing that will be useful to him in fighting for a great reform. Every man who wishes well to his country is in honor bound to take an active part in political life. If he does his duty and takes that active part he will be sure occasionally to commit mistakes and to be guilty of shortcomings. For these mistakes and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shortcomings he will receive the unmeasured denunciation of the critics who commit neither because they never do anything but criticise. Nevertheless he will have the satisfaction of knowing that the salvation of the country ultimately lies, not in the hands of his critics, but in the hands of those who, however imperfectly, actually do the work of the nation. I would not for one moment be understood as objecting to criticism or failing to appreciate its importance. We need fearless criticism of our public men and public parties; we need unsparing condemnation of all persons and all principles that count for evil in our public life: but it behooves every man to remember that the work of the critic, important though it is, is of altogether secondary importance, and that, in the end, progress is accomplished by the man who does the things, and not by the man who talks about how they ought or ought not to be done.

Therefore the man who wishes to do good in his community must go into active political life. If he is a Republican, let him join his local Republican association; if a Democrat, the Democratic association; if an Independent, then let him put himself in touch with those who think as he does. In any event let him make himself an active force and make his influence felt. Whether he works within or without party lines he can surely find plenty of men who are desirous of good government, and who, if they act together, become at once a power on the side of righteousness. Of course, in a government like ours, a man can accomplish anything only by acting in combination with others, and equally, of course, a number of people can act together only by each sacrificing certain of his beliefs or prejudices. That man is indeed unfortunate who cannot in any given district find some people with whom he can conscientiously act. He may find that he can do best by acting within a party organization; he may find that he can do best by acting, at least for certain purposes, or at certain times, outside of party organizations, in an independent body of some kind; but with some association he must act if he wishes to exert any real influence.

One thing to be always remembered is that neither independence on the one hand nor party fealty on the other can ever be accepted as an excuse for failure to do active work in politics. The party man who offers his allegiance to party as an excuse for blindly following his party, right or wrong, and who fails to try to make that party in any way better, commits a crime against the country; and a crime quite as serious is committed by the independent who makes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his independence an excuse for easy self-indulgence, and who thinks that when he says he belongs to neither party he is excused from the duty of taking part in the practical work of party organizations. The party man is bound to do his full share in party management. He is bound to attend the caucuses and the primaries, to see that only good men are put up, and to exert his influence as strenuously against the foes of good government within his party, as, through his party machinery, he does against those who are without the party. In the same way the independent, if he cannot take part in the regular organizations, is bound to do just as much active constructive work (not merely the work of criticism) outside; he is bound to try to get up an organization of his own and to try to make that organization felt in some effective manner. Whatever course the man who wishes to do his duty by his country takes in reference to parties or to independence of parties, he is bound to try to put himself in touch with men who think as he does, and to help make their joint influence felt in behalf of the powers that go for decency and good government.

Yet another thing to be remembered by the man who wishes to make his influence felt for good in our politics is that he must act purely as an American. If he is not deeply imbued with the American spirit he cannot succeed. Any organization which tries to work along the line of caste or creed, which fails to treat all American citizens on their merits as men, will fail, and will deserve to fail. Where our political life is healthy, there is and can be no room for any movement organized to help or to antagonize men because they do or do not profess a certain religion, or because they were or were not born here or abroad. We have a right to ask that those with whom we associate, and those for whom we vote, shall be themselves good Americans in heart and spirit, unhampered by adherence to foreign ideals, and acting without regard to the national and religious prejudices of European countries; but if they really are good Americans in spirit and thought and purpose, that is all that we have any right to consider in regard to them. In the same way there must be no discrimination for or against any man because of his social standing. On the one side, there is nothing to be made out of a political organization which draws an exclusive social line, and on the other it must be remembered that it is just as un-American to vote against a man because he is rich as to vote against him because he is poor. The one man has just as much right as the other to claim to be treated purely on his merits as a man. In short, to do good work in politics,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the men who organize must organize wholly without regard to whether their associates were born here or abroad, whether they are Protestants or Catholics, Jews or Gentiles, whether they are bankers or butchers, professors or day-laborers. All that can rightly be asked of one's political associates is that they shall be honest men, good Americans, and substantially in accord as regards their political ideas.

Another thing that must not be forgotten by the man desirous of doing good political work is the need of the rougher, manlier virtues, and above all the virtue of personal courage, physical as well as moral. If we wish to do good work for our country we must be unselfish, disinterested, sincerely desirous of the well-being of the commonwealth, and capable of devoted adherence to a lofty ideal; but in addition we must be vigorous in mind and body, able to hold our own in rough conflict with our fellows, able to suffer punishment without flinching, and, at need, to repay it in kind with full interest. A peaceful and commercial civilization is always in danger of suffering the loss of the virile fighting qualities without which no nation, however cultured, however refined, however thrifty and prosperous, can ever amount to anything. Every citizen should be taught, both in public and in private life, that while he must avoid brawling and quarrelling, it is his duty to stand up for his rights. He must realize that the only man who is more contemptible than the blusterer and bully is the coward. No man is worth much to the commonwealth if he is not capable of feeling righteous wrath and just indignation, if he is not stirred to hot anger by misdoing, and is not impelled to see justice meted out to the wrongdoers. No man is worth much anywhere if he does not possess both moral and physical courage. A politician who really serves his country well, and deserves his country's gratitude, must usually possess some of the hardy virtues which we admire in the soldier who serves his country well in the field.

An ardent young reformer is very apt to try to begin by reforming too much. He needs always to keep in mind that he has got to serve as a sergeant before he assumes the duties of commander-in-chief. It is right for him from the beginning to take a great interest in national, State, and municipal affairs, and to try to make himself felt in them if the occasion arises; but the best work must be done by the citizen working in his own ward or district. Let him associate himself with the men who think as he does, and who, like him, are sincerely devoted to the public good. Then let them try to make

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves felt in the choice of alderman, of councilman, of assemblyman. The politicians will be prompt to recognize their power, and the people will recognize it too, after a while. Let them organize and work, undaunted by any temporary defeat. If they fail at first, and if they fail again, let them merely make up their minds to redouble their efforts, and perhaps alter their methods; but let them keep on working.

It is sheer unmanliness and cowardice to shrink from the contest because at first there is failure, or because the work is difficult or repulsive. No man who is worth his salt has any right to abandon the effort to better our politics merely because he does not find it pleasant, merely because it entails associations which to him happen to be disagreeable. Let him keep right on, taking the buffets he gets good-humoredly, and repaying them with heartiness when the chance arises. Let him make up his mind that he will have to face the violent opposition of the spoils politician, and also, too often, the unfair and ungenerous criticism of those who ought to know better. Let him be careful not to show himself so thin-skinned as to mind either; let him fight his way forward, paying only so much regard to both as is necessary to enable him to win in spite of them. He may not, and indeed probably will not, accomplish nearly as much as he would like to, or as he thinks he ought to: but he will certainly accomplish something; and if he can feel that he has helped to elevate the type of representative sent to the municipal, the State, or the national legislature, from his district, or to elevate the standard of duty among the public officials in his own ward, he has a right to be profoundly satisfied with what he has accomplished.

Finally, there is one other matter which the man who tries to wake his fellows to higher political action would do well to ponder. It is a good thing to appeal to citizens to work for good government because it will better their estate materially, but it is a far better thing to appeal to them to work for good government because it is right in itself to do so. Doubtless, if we can have clean, honest politics, we shall be better off in material matters. A thoroughly pure, upright, and capable administration of the affairs of New York city would result in a very appreciable increase of comfort to each citizen. We should have better systems of transportation; we should have cleaner streets, better sewers, and the like. But it is sometimes difficult to show the individual citizen that he will be individually better off in his business and in his home affairs for taking part

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in politics. I do not think it is worth while to show that this will be the case. The citizen should be appealed to primarily on the ground that it is his plain duty, if he wishes to deserve the name of freeman, to do his full share in the hard and difficult work of self-government. He must do his share unless he is willing to prove himself unfit for free institutions, fit only to live under a government where he will be plundered and bullied because he deserves to be plundered and bullied, on account of his selfish timidity and short-sightedness. A clean and decent government is sure in the end to benefit all our citizens in the material circumstances of their lives; but each citizen should be appealed to, to take part in bettering our politics, not for the sake of any possible improvement it may bring to his affairs, but on the ground that it is his plain duty to do so, and that this is a duty which it is cowardly and dishonorable in him to shirk.

To sum up, then, the men who wish to work for decent politics must work practically, and yet must not swerve from their devotion to a high ideal. They must actually do things, and not merely confine themselves to criticising those who do them. They must work disinterestedly, and appeal to the disinterested element in others, although they must also do work which will result in the material betterment of the community. They must act as Americans through and through, in spirit and hope and purpose, and, while being disinterested, unselfish, and gentle in their dealings with others, they must also show that they possess the essential manly virtues of energy, of resolution, and of indomitable personal courage.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESEARCH THE VITAL SPIRIT OF TEACHING.

For years I have collected pictures of children of all sorts, and my collection now numbers many hundreds. The very finest expression on the face of a child or infant seems to me to be that of open-eyed and often open-mouthed curiosity and wonder. The objects of nature charm and entrance the soul, which for the moment becomes almost one with her. This state is akin to that striven for by all the ecstasy-cults from Plato down to Dante in his first vision of the Rose of Dawn. It is Schopenhauer's "adequate artistic contemplation," in which for a moment even the pain of existence is forgotten, and man becomes all eye and all ear envisaging the embodiments of the purest ideas. It is the "hedonic narcosis" of the best modern æsthetic theories. This divinest thing in childhood, which only bad school methods can kill, which prompts the primeval experiments of infants in learning to use their senses, limbs, and minds upon nature, is the root of the spirit of research, which explores, pries, inquires so persistently, and often so destructively in older children, and comes to full maturity in the investigator behind the telescope or microscope, in the laboratory, seminary, library, or on exploring expeditions. At its best, this spirit of research has awe and reverence enough in it to give it a high and positive religious character, and the best and most characteristic feature about the new movements in higher education that I am trying to describe is that its upward tendencies can best be characterized by the word "research," —a word, alas, now more often praised than understood.

It is many years since Von Sybel wrote his account of the German universities as harmonious combinations of teaching and investigation. In creating the *École pratique*, which represents the best educational influences in France, Duruy had as its chief object the development of scientific research, which he said was the strength of the German universities. Jowett not only used research-methods of teaching, but advocated, in the latter part of his life, special equipments for men who showed promise in research. Froude's recent inaugural urges that the backbone of higher education is the ability to do something.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Seth Low and others would make investigation the mark of the university as distinct from the college. Perhaps the best of the many discussions about the new Gresham University of London is the discussion between Fitzgerald, who would make research the first business of the new University, and Lord Kelvin, who would accord it large space, but less than that allotted to teaching. Presidents Gilman, Jordan, Coulter, Warfield, and Welling, Professors Rowland, Wright, J. E. Howard, Von Holst, C. Gross, John Pierce, and many others in this country, have lately said noble and stirring things for research. It emancipates the mind from error and superstition, makes us no longer content with second-hand knowledge, and transfigures work so that men come to love nothing so well as difficulties to be overcome. By varying and controlling conditions with lens, electrode, test-tube, and psychometer, it opens new fields as vast as the entire world presented to natural sense, in which the adult is, as it were, again born with wonder and curiosity as fresh as in childhood. It gets the mind into independent action, so that men become authorities and not echoes. Just as when the method of object-lessons was added to the old memory-cram, and, later, the method of manual training brought in eye- and motor-minded children who were thought dull before, so research has shown great power to discover as well as to develop talent, and makes tolerable successes of not a few otherwise very poor students. An eminent German professor would subordinate even buildings to research, and lately said that nothing would now contribute more to the advancement of chemistry than cheap laboratories that could be rebuilt every ten years to meet the new research problems of that magnificent science.

The deeper causes and effects of this movement here lie in the fact that individuality is thus developed. The movement from large classes to small elective groups is incomplete, and must culminate in personal aid and achievement. This appeals not only to the nature of youth, but to the spirit of democracy, where, in a peculiar sense, strength lies in a free and full individualization. Again, it is re-enforced by the newer anthropology, which regards man as two-thirds will, makes effort the highest and most educable part of his nature, and thus gives the method of research itself the highest value, even for lower schools, quite apart from the value of discoveries. To live is now to will: acts lay down the primitive strata in the soul which determine even the deepest belief. One of the most popular of recent German books, which passed through more than a score of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

editions in less than two years, was a forcible plea that the age of the professor who knows is now giving place to that of the artist who does or produces. In the days of the old New England farm, where every boy had active duties and was, in a sense, a member of the firm; in the days of the old debating-society and the earlier disputation, which from the time of Socrates down to the present century was the chief academic method,—there was far more to develop the active powers of youth than in the academic training which, with the decline of these things, languished until these days of research; and research, for the average man, is doubtless of far greater value for discipline than for discovery.

For research, the first need is a professor who not only points, but leads the way. The greatest investigators have been more born than made, and almost constitute a distinct class of men. They have the rare power to set themselves to work, and the rarer power to keep doing their best thing. If the course of experimentation suddenly makes worthless months of work and even methods and apparatus devised with care and cost, they extract all the lessons of failure and push on. Truth is their passion, and they have deliberately chosen it rather than repose. They live in and for their work. They carry an atmosphere charged with contagion and stimulus, of which would that there were some aureole or visible sign. They have followers—perhaps a school—wherever they are. They often have little encouragement, and sometimes meet special obstacles in the institutions among which they are scattered, while our scientific associations, societies, and academies are not strong enough and not organized in a way to give them either the moral, intellectual, or material aid afforded them in older countries. The distance between these men and the routine-lesson-hearing professor is too great to be estimated by any methods of psychological measurement yet devised. Perhaps it might be illustrated by the Professor in Winthrop's "Cecil Dreeme," about whom a few students sometimes were said to buzz, as hungry bees in a sheep pasture in late fall about a dried-up mullen-stalk, on the one hand, and the fennel-stick in which Prometheus brought down the divine fire, on the other. The joy of serving talent by opening fields of opportunity is great and abiding. Some are born teachers and come so to love the respect and guidance of young men that they are satisfied to be the popular idol of the students; but, useful and noble as this is, it is not the highest. Others make the best plans, perhaps even devise the best apparatus, but do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not put the work through. Still others drift into the histories of their departments and develop talent for antiquarian inquiry into what others have done; and again others develop taste and power for appeals to the public in popular lectures, articles, and books. All "this is," as the old general said of a manœuvre parade, "magnificent, but it is not war." At least, creative research and discovery is higher and rarer than any of these. A pupil of Helmholtz, himself distinguished before his early death, once said to me that it seemed almost as if his teacher's every serious thought was an addition to the sum of human knowledge,—perhaps the highest compliment ever paid a man of science.

Such very rare men, companions of the new life of education,—Pierce, Agassiz, Whitney, Leidy, Sylvester, and a score or two of others who have leavened their environment and polarized the lives of their students, are hardly the men described in the following significant extract from the presidential report of our oldest University for the year 1891–92, as follows:

"There seem to be three main considerations which affect the exchangeable value of a professor's services. The first is the success of his regular teaching, or, in other words, the success with which he gives instruction from six to ten hours a week during term time. The second consideration is his capacity for usefulness outside of his regular teaching, as, for example, in administrative work, scientific investigation, literary production, or in the varied activities which give social or public influence. The third is the length of his service. In estimating the value of a university officer there are often other considerations also, less tangible, or often even indescribable, but still of appreciable and sometimes decisive influence,—such as temperament, bearing, manners, tact, and humor."

One of the most stimulating and original professors I know in this country is not only an indifferent teacher, but he told me that he had failed in two institutions where the value of a professor's services was ranked as above. It might even be asked how much mental power should be sacrificed to secure that kind of "general moral influence over the students" which, in many colleges, holds the first place, and fitly so; but the real university professor must have the utmost freedom, and his individuality must be given the widest scope compatible with organization and harmony. Bearing and temperament, mood, the personal likes or dislikes of the president, must be absolutely subordinated to higher things. The psychoses of talent and genius often require as wide range as Mill suggests in his "Liberty." Sometimes prolonged and intense effort tends to react into "dumps" in all of us. To some, the routine and rules of common

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

college life are so irksome that for this, and, indeed, for other reasons, these choice men would have been failures under the old system. In the new "House of Solomon" they should have the best equipment, the largest pay, the freest air; for thus not merely the university, but the nation, receives with due honor its anointed prophets.

A central chapter in the new pedagogy of higher education should be given to the choice of topics for research. In running over the titles of many of the 60,000 theses for the doctorate, offered by a German firm, the triviality of a large number, in the departments I can judge of, is most striking. Scores of bright students whom I have known have worked one or two years upon topics that were nothing less than petty. Many are set by their professors to investigate points upon which only negative results are reached—work by no means worthless, but rarely of the highest value. More often candidates for degrees are given what is called "analogy work," *i.e.*, they take some recent and successful line of research and introduce some minor variation in the conditions to find its effect upon results. This type of thesis best insures against the risk of abortive issue. Others are given a small point in the professor's work because he can utilize it later. In most humanistic departments it is a late fad for German professors to give to American students American topics. Thus the student, although working at the disadvantage of absence from his fullest sources, is surest of successfully impressing his examiners. The dissertations of French candidates, although less in number, are bulkier and more likely to be of real value upon the historical side. The ratio of help by and help to the professor is more likely to fall to the advantage of the student. The worst dangers of specialization are liable to be realized at just this point. Instead of giving the young man a large view he is restricted to a narrow one. I asked a candidate whose thesis was accepted, and who was passing a successful examination in philology, including a number of questions about the forms of Lucretius, whether that author wrote drama, history, philosophy, prose, or poetry, and he did not know. Of our two largest American universities one requires research, but it need not be printed, the other requires only "high attainment." Thus the real value of the degree cannot be judged by the "consensus of the competent." Where the young investigator is not a candidate for a degree, but a research-assistant, or in a sense indentured to the professor, the case is, of course, very different. Larger risk can be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taken; the professor is more identified with the work; the student's identity merged, and although he really gets better training he must usually be paid more, because he has nothing individual to show for his work. Finally, the best professors, perhaps, differ in nothing more widely than in the degree in which the student's identity is brought out. Some suggest and aid the work of students in their laboratories, but by rule or custom not only own or control, but, perhaps, publish it as theirs "with the assistance of" or "jointly with" the student. Other instructors put all their own best work into the student's hands, not only giving him daily advice, but perhaps, like Ludwig at Leipzig, taking his crude curves, tables, and results, writes the entire memoir himself, and prints it under the student's name, stating merely the laboratory in which the work was done.

The founder and trustees of Clark University recently commissioned me to spend a year of inquiry—the sixth that I had so spent—among European universities. There were no questions I asked more constantly than those touching the best methods of initiating the best men into research. The notes thus gathered of ideal ways most approved may be summarized—making large allowances for different topics—somewhat as follows: First, as to choice of subjects: The professor should keep constant note of all suggestions from his reading or thinking, and, from the mob of these, some will slowly ripen, shoot together, or appear in perspective as essential over against the many non-essentials. Some stock of these every true scientific shepherd of souls will always keep on hand, with the best references, and more or less sprouted in his own mind and ready for transplantation or grafting. These must be topics capable of awakening as deep interest and as wide views as possible; they must be so central as to readily open into the largest fields of the department, for nothing is so educative as a good subject which can grow with the student's growth, and such a subject often makes, and even saves, men and careers. Here the quality of the professor appears; and a recent writer even suggests that the divinity of Jesus chiefly appeared in his power to select the essential and to avoid the unessential topics of human life and work. Conferences of instructors in related lines help to ripen such incubated subjects, and are of the highest value to the professors themselves.

In many departments,—anthropology, geology, meteorology, in some respects psychology, and all social, political, financial, and other fields,—the subjects that cry out for investigators are far richer and larger in our country than the same subjects in other lands. Re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

search on home topics is not merely an educational but a crying national need. Public, private, and industrial life suffers, and nowhere are there so many topics so well adapted to foster the spirit of research. If we would only cease to take things in too bookish ways, and gradually emancipate ourselves from undiscriminating worship of the educational ways of Europe, we should hear how loudly both physical nature and man call to American students to respect their own problems. Professor Barrett Wendell prefers real Americans like Edwards, Franklin, Poe, and Hawthorne to men of the spirit of our romantic historians, — Irving, Motley, Prescott, and Bancroft, who lived abroad; Mr. Hamlin Garland repeats Emerson's warning that imitation is suicide; Phillips Brooks asked if Americans will never cease to prefer foreign to domestic missions. In all these sentiments we should recognize new flavors to be judiciously used in preparing the symposium of research.

To assign topics to individuals is, in some fields, a no less delicate problem than choosing them. Often the fit man goes out to the fit subject the moment it is suggested. If possible, the theme should graft on to a vigorous and well-grown stock of native interest; it should appeal to the best and strongest there is in the student, and should bring out all his powers and focus his energies. Sometimes a selection may be made and urged by a wise teacher who knows his man. If such calling and election be made sure in whatever way, the doctor-thesis may determine—as indeed it often has—the entire after-development. I believe the choice of a right subject for a year's research is far more formative, for every active mind, than the election of courses. If the chosen subject fit the man and also be of fundamental rather than accessory nature, the energy that is evoked is often marvellous. I have known students who got up a fair reading-knowledge of a modern language from the beginning because they found it contained things vital for their chosen research. In two cases that I knew, a branch of mathematics was gotten up in the same way. To be inspired by an essential, fundamental, or material subject gives a vigorous young mind amazing power to conquer formal or expressive subjects like languages, methods, and technique, and gives a training in logic far better than the best cramming of any text-book upon that subject. All but dry youthful minds hate everything formal if divorced from what is material, as is done in so many educational ways, but work wonders with it if it is duly subordinated. Youth loves the new because it looks toward

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the future, and I doubt if any young man after twenty-five, or, at the most, thirty, should ever be called upon to pass much of an examination; he can certainly do better if he can do anything.

Wherever such teachers and fellows as I have tried to describe work together thus, with suitable equipment, there is a university, or the heart of one. It may have few or many departments or men, but there must be enough of both for comparison and co-ordination to work. In each department there must be enough men and themes of research, so that each may follow and co-operate in the work of all, and there must be enough related departments to stimulate and help each other. Too many students proportionately lessen the leader's efficiency for each. This is intensive rather than extensive university work. To define the "university" as this or that has generally been a note of provincialism: the word should cover all the very many and very different things implied in the highest education. But the foregoing is central, and teaching-institutions, professional schools, and, sometimes, technical, normal, preparatory, and even industrial schools, may be grouped about and even incorporated in a university with great gain to them and it, provided only the university be not without this soul. All these other institutions are liable to smoulder, and, like green wood, will extinguish any but a hot fire, which alone they make burn brighter. Wherever this real university spirit of research breaks out, there is life; the Holy Ghost speaks in modern accents; the old oracles find new voices, and who would and should not listen? As the Church universal is found wherever a few are gathered together who love God and do His will, so we might imagine a kind of University universal, of which all groups of students inflamed with the love of truth are corporate members. Indeed, the new *Reichs-Anstalt* of Berlin—which is now making the first serious attempt in the world to co-ordinate all German research in its departments, preventing duplication, helping those who need it, unfolding methods of co-operation between like departments in different universities, devising and assigning parts in great secular investigations that require great expense and many men—expresses the new methods of inter-institutional work from which much is to be hoped. The new academic spirit now heard in so many recent noble utterances, and felt in so many new plans for academic improvement, is, as I believe with all my heart and soul, the very best and most hopeful thing in all our national life. It is at its best full of the positive spirit of youth, and as remote as possible from the miasma of decadence and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pessimism that sometimes creeps into ancient seats of learning in periods of decline. The world and human life are so full; history so unwritten or so needing to be written again; the forms and laws of life so little known,—with all our nearly one million species catalogued! God's work, no less holy than His word, is dark only with excess of light. Nature never seemed so inexhaustive a reservoir of force; so complex yet so simple; so lawful in every part yet so lavishly beneficent to man; to those who truly love and wait upon her she never was so voluble, nor her revelations so precious; and the truth-seeker never so able to answer his own prayers.

I do not forget the dangers, the weakness, nor the self-deception that often result from attempted methods of research, but the investigator who merely finds a new species, who applies a method found good for moths to butterflies, whose sole achievement is to write the history of his little township, trace the uses of a Greek particle, or section the egg of a new worm, has at least come into touch with great and vital topics. The weakest thesis, which generally makes a tiny contribution to the sum of knowledge, puts the author—as every man of modern culture must be once in his life—beyond authority, books, custom, tradition, or habit, where he can take a fresh, independent look at reality. He ceases to be a passive recipient, escapes the insidious self-indulgence of knowing merely, and does or produces something, acts from scientific insight, critical testing, personal conviction. This is the university's accolade: "Stand erect, look about you, be free, that henceforth, whether conservative or radical, orthodox or sceptical, you may light your own way with independent knowledge." Young men in American higher institutions of learning, under twenty-five or even thirty, have done amazingly little; they have scarcely written even a good college song or a poem that will live; they have ground fairly well in the mills of examination and produced some respectable parodies, burlesques, and satires; but youth is the age for creation, for striking out new lines, as the many recent studies of talent and genius make more than ever manifest. Youth in this country, according to the general testimony of their foreign professors, excel in native powers, and, if they lack special discipline, more than atone for it in energy and common sense—for which life in this country is the best school on earth. Let us cease to sin against these *élite* youth of our nation, as we so grievously do in ways indicated in my last article in THE FORUM, that the next century may find the beginnings of a higher and more national academic nurture.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us glance at what the method of free investigation has done for Germany. In 1806 the army and industries of Prussia were shattered at a blow by the battle of Jena, the state was poor, its soil infertile, its spirit unpractical, its military situation the worst in history, and its record fuller of discord than of unity; the race had never felt such humiliation, and its future never seemed so dark. But the German stock was still vigorous. Scharnhorst reconstructed the military system, and Stein the land-laws and status of the peasants on the present basis. Jahn founded everywhere his patriotic *turn* societies and preached again the gospel of ancient Greece that only strong muscles can make nations great and men free. But the key-note which guided and unified all was spoken by Fichte in his famous "Addresses to the German Nation," which were given in Berlin every Sunday evening for an entire winter to large audiences of the best classes, with Napoleon's sentries at the door and his spies scattered through the hall. He said in substance this:

> We still have left us German bodies large, strong, and healthy to the core, a marvellous language all our own, and not agglomerate of many tongues like English, and a pure blood never mixed with other races. We have wrought out the Reformation, the greatest task the human spirit has yet achieved, and our ancestors call to us not to let the work they died in doing be in vain. We carry the light and hope of the world; if we sink, freedom and humanity sink with us. It is not primarily by armies or legislation, but we must rise, if we rise at all, by the slow and sure processes of national education. We must now live for our children, training their bodies and minds as was never done in the world before. Schools have been the one product in which Germany has already excelled. We have set the soul of man free, and have preached, taught, lived, and believed in ideas and ideals. We must make education our supreme task; we must realize the Platonic republic, where the wisest ruled and education was the chief problem for statesmanship. This policy must be our destiny; our leaders must be priests of truth and in her pay; they must think fearlessly and ceaselessly in all directions; must investigate and discuss; do and suffer all in the world's great holy cause of science and learning.

To this end he invoked all ranks and classes, for thus not only the united Fatherland—long hoped for, long delayed—could become real, but men of a higher type than had yet appeared would be developed.

Thus Fichte, idealist and enthusiast, spoke and was heard as no man had spoken or been heard since Luther. For him education was the one divine cause in the world,—a new dispensation of religion itself. In accordance with his conception, but by far more practical men than he, the University of Berlin was founded and a national policy defined making education the test of all. Along these lines

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Fatherland has become one of the strongest and best-governed states in history. Just as the Reformation slowly pervaded other lands, so Germany has set the educational fashions for most nations of continental Europe. Her methods have been especially influential since the war of 1870 made manifest the strength that this policy had developed in two generations. The German university is to-day the freest spot on earth. As in the Middle Ages, some still have their own court and prison, the rector is exempt from prosecution during office, and the professor's private property is exempt from taxation. Across the street from the palace of an autocratic and high-church emperor, principles subversive of the state and of instituted religion have often been taught with impunity. Bauer was not only professor but pastor, preaching with power in the established church while promulgating his well-known mythic theory of the gospel and the early church.

Research has always been the touchstone upon which the value of university work was tested. This relentless inquiry has been pursued more exclusively by professors with less co-operation from advanced students than the present demands. But nothing has been exempt. God and the existence of the external world have been investigated, and the universe evolved from pure thought, being, *ego*, will, cosmic gas; and even absurdities have had free scope. Never has the world seen such burning and all-sided curiosity. What is matter, soul, type, idea? How and why did they come to be? What are all the forms of knowledge abstractly possible for thought, and of existence possible for being? What is the essence of life, love, freedom, duty, law, state, religion? All the old forms of laws and belief men had lived by were upturned and every possibility explored in quest of deeper foundations. But the most perfect liberty was never more perfectly vindicated by its fruits. In all this ferment shallow and bad ideas have died, and truth has come to new power. While weak men have passed through a period of confusion, and some have grown sterile, strong natures have only struck deeper root.

Thus freed and limbered by speculation, scientific curiosity turned toward the past and nature. Literature, scriptural, classic, and ethnic; languages, new and old, cultured and savage; history in all its departments,—have been explored by men whose names are household words with scholars. The very soil of ancient states has been spaded and sifted. Discoveries great and small without number, new standpoints and methods, have reconstructed as well as vastly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enlarged our knowledge of every nation and tongue, hero and institution of the past. So, too, within the memory of men now living, chemistry and biology have been almost created, and the sphere of mathematics, astronomy, physics, and geology vastly extended. Science has given us a new and indefinitely larger heaven and earth, and stands forth as the greatest achievement of human effort thus far. Never have so many men stood so close to nature and history, or striven with such reverence to think God's thoughts after Him exactly, as in the Philosophical Faculty which is devoted to investigation, and which is the heart of the German university, and to be united with which saves technical and professional schools from narrowness and dryness.

Count, now, all the learned societies and academies in Germany, where all who would rise must investigate, where the best specialists stimulate each other, where "archives" and other serials by the score contain solely the results of original research; observe the honors and opportunities of many kinds bestowed on leaders; and study all the ways by which the best of this material sifts and filters down from the top—which is the one source of vitality in an educational system—to the bottom, in university seminaries for teachers, lectures, textbooks, apparatus, practical schools of all kinds; and see what all this has brought in military success, in mental power, growing industrial leadership, and what vastly larger things are now dreamed of in the future,—and we shall then understand what the Educational State of Fichte's dream has now come to mean. There are defects, of course, and they are patent, but there is far larger room for the exercise of the higher and rarer powers of sympathetic appreciation and respect.

A far wider field opens now and to us. Of course, the ideal university will not float down to us from the heavens like the new Jerusalem: it will not come by observation, nor yet by teaching alone. It is sure to need a larger academic policy shaped more by the faculty, who can be best trusted with the interests of science if their quality is once well established. All the examinations in the world will never lead up to it. Arbitrary assertion, unproven facts, and unassimilated knowledge weaken the zest for truth. Goethe, Schiller, and the great men of that period, we are told, never passed an examination. But I am bold enough to declare that a student is one who studies, really studies, and the word means nothing else; he has learned to trust himself and lets himself go. As Lowell says, he has learned that the universe is fireproof and he need not fear if he strikes a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

match. Every new research requires some, though not usually great, special expenditure for construction of new apparatus and purchase of special literature, and cannot be done at institutions which "plant but do not water," and which must work with the wolf forever at the door. In a young country, with young men more dominant than ever in the world before, dowered with the genius of practical achievement, memory work was never so chokingly dry, and, with all our vast problems, doing was never so inspiring. Let our universities accept and not resist our manifest destiny, and co-operate to unfold the discipline that comes by doing. The more and better the books, apparatus, and professors, and the fewer the students, if their promise increase inversely as their numbers, the better the work. It is all the kingdom of the spirit, and too infinitely delicate to brook much meddling. Excessive teaching palls and kills; but the instruction of such men as I would see, and one of whom I would myself be above all things if I could, is a revelation. It is dealing with knowledge that is alive, not dead; that is fresh from the sources, and not second- or third-hand. As President Coulter has so well shown, student-fees are, and must be, but a small part of the income of any true university, any real "workshop of the Holy Ghost." The true university is still, in Lowell's phrase, like Milton's "tawny lion pawing to get free"; but when it does get free, it will regenerate the college and the lower school. The fear of duplication and the spirit of rivalry between institutions will merge into the co-operation necessary in the vastly larger field with its countless new problems, not only of science but of administration. The common sense of it all is, that the university should rest solely on the love of knowledge, and the true investigator refines, and over and over again returns to, his method and thought till it is simple and direct, great but easily mastered because stated in a way to present the least possible resistance. He talks "with the rifle and not with the water-hose"; and the clearer and more permeable for other minds science becomes, the more it tends to express itself in terms of willed action, which is the language of complete men.

G. Stanley Hall.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IDEAL TRAINING OF AN AMERICAN BOY.

In the American education of to-day there are two things which force themselves upon our attention: (1) that it is in a chaotic condition; (2) that this condition is, in the main, due to our having no definite notion of what education is aiming at.

Whoever, therefore, would seek to suggest a way out of this condition must begin by making as clear as possible some aim which our people shall recognize as that which, however blindly, they have always been endeavoring to reach,—in a word, the fundamental ideal of American life, of American manhood. That such an ideal exists, and that it is slowly moulding us into its form, can hardly be doubted by any one who has considered the course of history and our place in it. We need not be discouraged by the fact that this ideal, as at present understood, produces characteristics which render us unattractive to the citizens of older nations, as is shown by the meaning attached in France and Italy to the term "Americanism." The early effects of any new ideal of life are always somewhat unprepossessing, and there are obvious reasons why this should be especially true of American life. For what is this ideal which we, as Americans, are so obstinately, and yet so blindly, following, and which is making us what we are, with all our faults and all our virtues? It may be indicated (not, at present, expressed) by the magic word "Freedom." Hegel, with deep insight, said, "Human history is a progress in the consciousness of freedom," and we form the vanguard in that progress. Our great difficulty, and the cause of all our faults, is that we have not, thus far, arrived at any clear conception of the meaning and implications of freedom; and this is just what we must do before we can pursue our ideal with dignity, or establish any system of education which shall make such pursuit possible. The first step, therefore, toward answering the question, What is the ideal education for an American boy?—must be to define freedom: that freedom which is the ferment and self-realizing energy of American life, regarded as the highest and inevitable outcome of the process of history.

By "freedom," then, I mean that power, which necessarily be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

longs to the self-conscious being, of determining his actions in view of the highest, the universal good, and thereby of gradually realizing in himself the eternal divine perfections—of being "perfect as the Father which is in heaven is perfect."

When, therefore, we speak of a system of education for Americans, we do not mean merely a system suited to their needs as members of that state whose visible centre is Washington, D. C., but a system suited to eternal spirits living under social and political conditions more favorable than ever existed before for their self-unfolding and self-realization. It is just the existence of these conditions, and this alone, that confers upon America all the worth it possesses, and gives it a valid claim to our highest moral enthusiasm. It is simply and solely because, for the first time in the world's history, it offers the conditions under which men, by realizing the divinity latent in them, may become absolutely free, each a law unto himself, that it has its supreme claim upon us as moral beings. It is this, and nothing less, that is the American ideal: it is this that must, sooner or later, shape our entire educational system.

But it will be said, Such an ideal is not merely American: it is universal and human. Of course it is: this is just what the American ideal ought to be. It is pure folly to try to cultivate an American provincialism, something which, like Gallicism and Anglicism, shall be less than universal humanity. If America is to perform the part assigned to her in history, she must stand for ideal humanity and compel all partial ideals to converge and lose themselves in hers. Her citizens must be morally autonomous, regarding all institutions as servants, not as masters; as expressions of their own freedom; as instruments for the realization of greater freedom. In the world hitherto, in spite of the fundamental teachings of Christianity, man has been, for the most part, a thrall, owning obedience to a law conceived to be external to him, and other than the expression of his own true nature. In a word, he has been heteronomous. In American life it must no longer be so. The true American must worship the inner God, recognized as his own deepest and eternal self; not an outer God, regarded as something different from himself. And one need not be much of a prophet to see that this is the goal to which, with all our blindness and all our faults, we are steadily tending. Ideal Americanism means absolute moral autonomy.

We may now, therefore, put the question in this form: By what education may a boy be prepared for complete moral auton-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

omy, and for playing a worthy part in an order of things intended to guide every human being to the same? Put in this form, the question does not seem difficult to answer. The essential conditions of moral autonomy are easily assignable. They are: (1) well-arranged, practical knowledge of men and things; (2) healthy, well-distributed affections; (3) a ready will, loyal to such knowledge and such affections. To realize these, then, must be the aim of American education.

It will be readily seen that from this education two things are excluded, namely, erudition and professional training. Valuable and necessary as these are, they form no part of the education of the American as American, or of man as man. The subject now under consideration is the education of the citizen and of the man as such.

But we have still before us the question, How shall this result be reduced to practice? And here let us simplify matters as much as possible. Let us suppose that we have to deal with parents whose children are thoroughly healthy, and who are not only able, but also willing, to give them the best of educations. Let us suppose that such parents come to us and say: "We are convinced that your ideal of education is the true one, but we do not see exactly by what method and means it is to be realized." What shall we say to them? What advice shall be given them about governesses, tutors, home-education, schools, and the like? To answer these questions fully would carry us far beyond the limits of the present article. All that can be done here is to indicate certain guiding principles.

As our aim is moral autonomy, and this rests upon intelligence, well-distributed affection or interest, and ready will, our efforts must be directed to the harmonious cultivation of these. And all experience, I believe, shows that, in the early stages of education, this can be far better carried out in the family, under the eyes of parents, than in the school, or even in the public kindergarten. A child's character is practically formed, for good or for evil, during the first seven years of its life, and it is then that the utmost thoughtfulness and watchfulness on the part of parents are demanded. During this time, education should, as far as possible, be unconscious, and therefore should be carried on by those methods and means which may be applied unconsciously. A child ought never to learn consciously anything that it can learn unconsciously; never be instructed in anything that it can acquire by imitation or habituation. It is the failure to observe this principle that is the crowning defect of the Froebelian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kindergarten system as it is practised in America. It may be set down, as a general truth, that all knowledge or habit consciously acquired is prosaic, insecure, and dead, compared with that which comes through unconscious imitation. It is the latter that is the storehouse of poetry.

The daily life of the family, with its manners, conversation, occupations, and interests, is now the main teacher; and as this is, so will the world and life of the child be. Though nothing can replace this, nevertheless it may be supplemented by the employment of French and German governesses, who shall make their respective languages native to the child from the first. Such governesses ought always to be trained teachers, and, when employed, should be treated as members and trusted friends of the family. It is a great misfortune for a child who is to move in the higher walks of life not to have complete command of the three world-languages. The lack of any of them greatly limits that free and easy contact with men which is essential to a practical knowledge of them. Moreover, each language represents a distinct form of consciousness, and the more of these forms one has, the freer and more sympathetic he is. The naturally bilingual man belongs spiritually to two nationalities. But other things besides languages may be imparted unconsciously at this stage. Important among these are right sympathies and self-control. In any education whose aim is moral autonomy, nothing is more essential than a correct distribution of sympathy or affection, or, to use the ancient phrase, than loving and hating well. And nothing is so much neglected in American education. The stupidly sentimental notion that the child must, under any circumstances, have a "good time" (as the vulgar phrase is), causes many parents to allow children to follow their natural caprices, wasting their interest and affection upon trivial or even hurtful things, and disregarding those that are worthy and beneficial. There is nothing that the child is so thankful for in the long run as the careful and kindly training of his affections; there is nothing that contributes so much to his moral worth and happiness. Closely connected with the result of this training is that self-control which is the essential element in moral autonomy. In the child this takes the forms of sustained attention, and courage to carry out his wishes in defiance of difficulties and instinctive shrinkings,—forms both of which will be found of the utmost value in the subsequent course of education.

It is not difficult to see that in the process of evoking well-ordered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sympathies and establishing self-control, a large amount of information will have been imparted to the child, and that, too, in the form fitted to render it a basis for ethical choice. Just what this information shall be may, to some extent, be allowed to depend on the natural tastes of the child. The wise teacher will care less for what is imparted than for the spirit in which it is assimilated, and the emotional relation in which it places the child to the things in the world about him.

When a child has reached the age of seven, the parents should seek to combine with other parents holding views of education similar to their own, in order to establish a small private school, to be directed by a competent teacher, standing in intimate and confidential relations with them. This school the child ought to attend with the utmost regularity for the next four or five years, for a number of hours (varying with the seasons) daily. The aims of the education imparted during these years will be four: (1) to bring the child into noble and kindly relations to other children, enabling it to practise generosity and self-control; (2) to strengthen its body and its social instincts by healthy, not over-boisterous games; (3) to develop its memory; (4) to put it in possession of the means of future education, reading, writing, manual facility (including drawing), and the elements of music. Whatever is imparted beyond these should be taught in connection with the lessons in reading, memory-exercise, and manual training.

In connection with the first will be taught a good deal of geography, history, biography, and ethnology; with the second a great many gems of poetry and prose, and the paradigms and more familiar words of Latin and Greek; with the third, the elements of geometry, mechanics, and art, plastic and graphic. The reading-lessons should, of course, extend to all the languages the child knows. The subjects of them should consist largely of mythology, biography—Confucius, Çakya-muni, Themistocles, Socrates, Julius Cæsar, Jesus, Paul, Mohammed, Charlemagne, Alfred, Gregory VII., St. Bernard, St. Francis, Savonarola, Luther, Queen Elizabeth, Columbus, Washington, Lincoln,—and poetry of the heroic sort—Homer, Virgil, Dante (in translation), Tennyson, Lowell. It is worth bearing in mind that poetry worth reading in school is worth committing to memory, and the more of this that is done, the better. Once every year, say at Christmas, the older children ought to act a play, such as Goethe's "Iphigenie," Beaumarchais' "Le Mariage de Figaro," or Tenny-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

son's "Becket." Few people but those who have superintended or taken part in the acting of such plays can imagine how valuable they are as a means of education, or how well boys and girls can act them.

If children have been properly trained and instructed in the family and the small private school, they ought to be ready, at the age of eleven or twelve, to attend a large school, private or public, and to do so without any detriment to their feelings, manners, and morals. That such schools have many advantages is certain: that they have many drawbacks is equally so. In the case of boys more especially, the choice lies between them and private tutors, and to which of them the preference shall be given must depend largely upon what relation parents desire their sons to hold to life. If, like most American parents, they wish their boys to be good solid citizens of the current stamp, with the ordinary social, economic, and political interests, and with what they would call a wholesome dread of any departure from the code of respectability accepted by their class, they will send them to large schools, where, in contact with other boys, they are pretty sure to be cured of any notions or ideals that rise above the average, or in any way depart from it. If, on the other hand, as is rarely the case, parents desire to develop the individuality of their sons, to place them beyond the influence of current opinion, and so to aid in rendering them morally autonomous, they will place them in charge of carefully selected private tutors, and allow them to travel for a considerable portion of the years from twelve to eighteen, both in their own country and abroad.

If, now, as I have tried to show, moral autonomy, resting on large experience and wide, well-distributed sympathies, is the ideal of American life, and therefore of American education, there can be no doubt in which direction the choice ought to fall. The tutor and travel are in all cases to be preferred to the large school. Of course the tutor must be a man of high culture and character, and bent upon developing the same in his pupils; and the plan of travel must be carefully arranged, so as not to conflict with the programme of study. Moreover, many of the best results of public-school life may be secured if two or three well-trained boys travel under the care of one tutor or of different tutors. It ought to be observed that foreign travel with American tutors is something very different from foreign residence with foreign tutors. The latter is always to be strongly deprecated, as tending to render boys not only unpatriotic, but also

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insensible to what constitutes the worth of American life. There is nothing which so sharply distinguishes American boys from all others as their freshness and purity of life, and these qualities are likely to suffer from contact with European—especially with French and German —boys. A Europeanized American is nearly always a moral eunuch.

It is very difficult to overestimate the value of carefully managed travel for young Americans. Our distance from other peoples, and the rarity of our opportunities for seeing foreign life, coupled with a certain supercilious insularity inherited from England, impart to us a kind of provincialism which is not only unpleasant socially, but also detrimental to moral autonomy. Foreign travel in early life does away with this, and renders the American truly cosmopolitan, as he ought to be. But it does much more than this. It offers opportunities for a study of human history in all its departments,—ethnic, social, political, industrial, æsthetic, religious,—such as nothing else could give. It imparts to foreign literature, ancient and modern, a meaning and a reality which it can never attain in a schoolroom. How different is "The Odyssey" read on the shores of the Ægean, "The Oresteia" read in the Dionysiac theatre in Athens or on the acropolis of Mycenæ, the Platonic "Phædo" read in the "prison of Socrates," the odes of Horace read on the hills behind Subiaco, or the orations of Cicero read in sight of the Roman Forum, from what they are when read as parsing exercises in the school of a "crammer" for Harvard or Yale! And how different is even the Bible when read in Judea from what it is elsewhere! But travel does yet more: it allows boys to see, under the most favorable circumstances, the great products of ancient, mediæval, and modern art, to exercise themselves in foreign languages, to become acquainted with the scenes of great historic events, and, last but not least, to obtain that individual attention which is so essential to true culture, and so difficult to give in large schools. This last advantage alone, it seems to me, is sufficient to turn the balance in favor of tutorial over school education. A large school is nearly always a hot-house of mediocrity in scholarship and philistinism in morals.

It need hardly be added that, while travelling, boys should be instructed in all those subjects in which they expect to be examined before entering college,—that is, if they intend to take that step. And most boys with sufficient means and preparation will do so. Since our better colleges now admit considerable latitude of choice in the matter of entrance examinations, the tutor who understands his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

calling will encourage his pupils to devote themselves to those subjects which either (1) develop capacity, or (2) are an aid and preparation for all future study, or (3) contribute to large thoughtfulness and self-control. Under the first head will come logic, mathematics, physics, and drawing; under the second, especially languages, Hebrew,[1] Greek, Latin, French, German, English, and, if opportunity offer, Italian; under the third, history, biography, poetry, and the elements of ethics, politics, and æsthetics. If it be said that a tutor capable of giving instruction in all these subjects would be very difficult to find, I shall reply, The more's the pity! That only shows that our universities do not turn out men of broad general culture; for to this an acquaintance with all these subjects belongs. But let the demand once arise, and I doubt not the supply will soon be forthcoming. There is great gain in having the whole of a boy's education superintended by one man, provided he be great enough. The wise tutor, while encouraging the above studies, will at the same time discourage those which promise none of these results, or promise them only in a small degree—botany, physiology, zoology, etc. In all his teaching, moreover, he will take the utmost care never to let his pupils think that they are studying merely in order to pass an examination, but always to make them feel that the only end of study is complete autonomous manhood. He will also do his best to show them how, and in what degree, each study contributes to this end, so that they may never feel, as so many boys do at present, that they are studying merely because some one else wishes them to do so, and, consequently, that their work is a slavish, unprofitable task. A boy who does not feel that every hour he spends in study is spent for the sake of the highest end he knows and desires, is in an immoral frame of mind and by no means on the way toward moral autonomy. The greatest triumph of a tutor is to make his pupils feel that what he requires of them is the very best thing they could be doing. If he fails in this, he has virtually failed altogether; for every hour that a self-conscious human being spends without feeling that it is bringing him nearer to the goal of his aspirations is an hour slavishly and unrighteously wasted.

In saying that the years from twelve to eighteen in the life of a boy whose parents desire for him the ideal American culture should

[1] It is an almost inexplicable absurdity that Hebrew, the literature of which has contributed so largely to our ordinary consciousness, should not be placed on an equal footing in education with Greek and Latin. It is easier than either!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be spent with a tutor in travel, I do not mean either that the whole of this travel should be in foreign countries, or that it should not be broken by periods of home-study. The contrary, indeed, is my opinion. A boy ought never to be long withdrawn from his country or his home.

I have said that most boys who find themselves in a position to do so will go to college about the age of eighteen. Nor will they be wrong in doing so: for, notwithstanding all the drawbacks of our colleges; their want of definite unitary aim and ideal; their half-mediæval, half-professional curricula; the dry, uninspiring formalism and useless erudition of much of the teaching; the easy philistinism or dreary pessimism of many of the older teachers; the pert, callow Germanism of many of the younger ones; the boyishness of many of the students; their smug foppishness and stupid devotion to half-brutal games and half-silly girls,—notwithstanding all this and much more, there are elements in college life which the youth who aims at free manhood cannot afford to overlook. It is at college that the young man who by discipline, study, and travel has attained self-control, an earnest view of life, and a large, generous outlook, can best put these qualities to a practical test, by mingling, on free and easy terms, with men of his own age, entering into intimate relations with them, and comparing their aims with his own. He is now old enough to have definite views and purposes, but not too old to learn how they must be modified in order to be serviceable in the actual world. And nowhere can he learn this sooner or better than at college.

It is natural enough to suppose that the value of college life is due to what is done in the solitary study and in the class-room, whereas in truth it is due mainly to the social and friendly relations which the students establish with each other. Accordingly, the wise parent, in trying to select a college for his son, will ask first, not where the most learned professors are (still less, of course, where the best baseball team is, or where most sons of millionaires congregate!), but where the tone of social life is purest and manliest; where the young men behave neither as young monkeys nor as rakes; where the conditions for complete moral autonomy are most fully established. At the same time he will ask what college best understands its business,—which is to impart that culture, intellectual and moral, which is essential to free manhood, and does not attempt to forestall the university by dabbling in professional knowledge or erudition.

And this second question introduces an element of great difficulty;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for—and this is one of the great obstacles to true education among us —in America we have never learned to distinguish clearly between the college and the university, between education for manhood and citizenship, and education for a profession (which includes erudition). It is this fact, coupled with the want of any clear ideal of life[1] and education, that has induced some of our colleges to introduce the system of elective studies, a temporary compromise (let us hope!) enabling young men who know what education is, to obtain it, at the same time not driving away those very numerous school-products who have no conception of free manhood, but whose only aim in life is an easy, lucrative, respectable profession. In such colleges, particularly if they are large, it is generally possible for a young man, by making a wise selection of studies, to obtain a fair education, and to prepare himself to acquire the professional training necessary for any sphere of future usefulness which he may choose. Perhaps I cannot close this article better than by attempting to outline the scheme of such an education.

Since, as we have seen, the aim of education is the free, self-directing man, the man ready and able to act intelligently, nobly, and strongly in all the affairs of life; the man who, while taking full account of the world in which he has to act, does not find the principle or sanction of his action there, but in his own righteous will,—it is obvious that the matter of education will include mainly those sciences which relate to man, and his relations to the world of nature and the world of spirit,—the humanities, as the good old expression was. The mathematical, physical, and philological sciences, as not answering directly to this description, will occupy a subordinate position. After much careful observation and inquiry I am convinced that these sciences, important as they otherwise are, have comparatively little educational value. Mathematics are, indeed, good "mental gymnastics," and it is certainly important to understand the methods and main results of the physical and philological sciences; but more cannot be said.

In the first years of college life much attention will be given to ancient literature—Greek, Latin, Hebrew—and to history. These are essential to any large, generous view of the world in which we live. At the same time, and later, will be studied philosophy of history, ethics, sociology, politics, economics, and the various systems

[1] To judge from the tone of most of our educational literature, it would seem that our teachers do not even know whether they are living for time or for eternity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of speculative philosophy in historic sequence, comparative theology and history of religion, with a fair amount of psychology and epistemology. Now should be studied the leading works on evolution, biological and social, the sacred books of the great religions, the masterpieces of ancient and modern art, the leading treatises in Hindoo, Greek, mediæval and modern philosophy, and, with a philosophical commentary, the writings of the great philosopher poets, "Job," the "Oresteia," the "De Rerum Natura," the "Divine Comedy," "Faust," "In Memoriam." Such works may, indeed, be used with great advantage as texts for lectures on the deepest problems of art, ethics, and religion.[1] They are admirably fitted to impart to young men that breadth, earnestness, and quiet enthusiasm which are so essential to true culture.

I do not pretend, in the paragraph above, to have given more than the barest suggestion of a course of college study. To develop it in detail would require a separate article, which may possibly come hereafter. But I have perhaps done enough to indicate the kind of study suitable for the American boy who aims at realizing in himself that free humanity which has been the aim of the "travail of the ages," and for which his country offers conditions such as were never offered before. He who reaches this ideal, who by a careful training of his intelligence, his affections, and his will, places himself in a normal relation to himself and the universe, will, without any narrow dogmatic instruction, find himself in that persistent attitude of love and worship which alone confers consecration and blessedness on life, and gives a man the right to say that he is educated.

I am aware that the ideal which I have set up in this article is high and unworldly; but I am sure that it is the true American ideal, and I know that it has been already realized by not a few of our young men. For it should never be forgotten that, in spite of all that is said, and justly said, abroad, about the irreverence and flippancy of "Yankee" children, the noblest types of young manhood, as well as of young womanhood, that the world knows, are to be found in America.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

[1] There is no greater lack in our colleges generally than that of a "professor of poetry," a man thoroughly acquainted with the works of the great poets, and having a profound philosophic culture enabling him to bring out their world significance. Mere literary lectures on these works, such as our colleges sometimes offer, are nothing less than a degradation and a mockery.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WILL THE CO-EDUCATED CO-EDUCATE THEIR CHILDREN?

A NUMBER of serious-minded educators were lately discussing the old but ever new problems of co-education. I say "problems" advisedly; for it is not now one simple question, Shall women be admitted to universities or shall they not?—but, as years go on, and experience gives its results, and diverse conditions reveal themselves, the problem becomes a protean one whose many phases almost baffle the investigator. In the group referred to, one member meditatively said: "If we could only find out what the women themselves think about it now,—those that have been graduated at co-educational colleges and are now married and in their own homes! Will they send their children—their boys and girls—to co-educational institutions?" This question came to the ear of one who believed such testimony could be produced, and the result of an effort to gather the consensus of opinion is here given.

Resort was made to the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ—a society which has several times furnished statistics with which to prop some bastion of defence under special attack. Admitting to its membership the alumnæ of Boston, Cornell, Northwestern, Syracuse, and Wesleyan Universities, the State universities of California, Kansas, Michigan, and Wisconsin, Oberlin College, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the four great colleges for women, Bryn Mawr, Smith, Vassar, and Wellesley,—the fifteen institutions that are acknowledged to be of highest rank in the United States that give degrees to women,—its 1,639 members stand for an estimated 3,500 women-graduates of the institutions named. Before such a company of women with degrees as this, containing some 175 Masters of Arts, 29 Doctors of Philosophy, and a sprinkling of women professors from university chairs, and representing that larger body of alumnæ from other and not less admirable institutions not members of this special association, one who fears the effects on society through widening the sphere of woman might well stand aghast and exclaim with that German professor who was told that an American woman,—Catherine Beecher—had written the best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

answer to Edwards "On the Will" that had ever been made, "Then may heaven forgive Christopher Columbus for discovering America!" But perhaps the existence of a society of women of like attainments, and banded for practical educational work, will not be thought hostile to the best interests of society. By its conservative policy in admitting institutions of less than the highest rank; by the character and widely scattered residence of its membership (for they are found not only in all States of the Union, but in many foreign lands also); by the moderation and thoroughness of its educational work,—the Association has come to be looked upon as a sort of palladium of the interests of the higher education of women. The increase in attendance of women at colleges has of late been great, the members representing the classes from 1855 to 1867 averaging only about one a year, while from 1868 to 1879 there are 26, and from 1880 to 1892 there are over 103, representing each year's graduates. The great body of the membership, then, are young women, graduates of the last decade; but of women graduating before 1875, who are to-day about forty years old, many with sons or daughters of college age, there were in the Association 160, who, with a few graduating a little later, made a list of 180 married women.

To these a letter was sent, asking for a frank and unbiassed confession of the faith now held, after experience of years, on the pros and cons of the question, and especially for information as to whether alumnæ would now send their children—sons and daughters both—to co-educational institutions. The prayer for an answer by return of mail was responded to by 133, who must have been either particularly business-like and accommodating, or else very willing—not to say anxious—to be heard on this important subject.

Their replies will be encouraging to believers in co-education, 109 being on this side. Some are surprised to hear that the question is still *sub judice*. Several do not consider any objection tenable, and about 40 declare co-education to be the natural way:—

"I believe in co-education just as I believe in co-nursing, co-feeding, co-living in general."

"Nature's way of setting the sexes in families should be enough without further argument."

About 20 are less enthusiastic, stating distinct reservations; three strongly favor separate schools, and one has formed no opinion. In giving selections from these interesting letters, an attempt will be made to give both typical passages and the strongest arguments pro and con.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The intellectual, social, and moral advantages of educating men and women together are set forth in the following selections:

"The association is intellectually an inspiration, socially a benefit, and morally a restraint."

"I should most certainly prefer to send my children to co-educational universities: boys, because of the added stimulus to conscientious, scholarly work derived from the example of the girls in their classes; and girls, because of the greater likelihood of their securing a fair standard of work."

"It is in the interest of woman's advancement that men should learn increasingly to respect her intellect, and also that she herself should discover that she has an intellect which can cope with man's without disparagement. It will take away her timidity and give her courage. Women need courage perhaps more than any other quality—in order to seize and make use of the opportunities which are opening to them more and more."

"I believe that intellectually both sexes are stimulated and helped by association with each other, and that morally the habits of each are improved or kept from deterioriating, as is too frequently the case when either sex gets together in large numbers. There is set up a healthful interchange of thought and magnetic attraction between the sexes, which, when not debased, adds the chief charm to society and lays the foundation for the greatest spiritual development and inspiration of both."

"The constant association tends to lessen rather than create the desire for each other's society, for that desire is impelled largely by curiosity and the fascination which always surrounds the forbidden."

"It does away with much false modesty that afflicts girls who are kept to themselves, while it does not in the least detract from a girl's true modesty and refinement."

"Of course we cannot overlook the special times of life when feeling is stronger than thought, but I firmly believe these dangers are lessened rather than aggravated by the frequent association of young men and women under circumstances in which neither class is a special object of interest to the other, but all are working for a common end."

"It leads to a broader sympathy, a truer understanding between men and women; and it tends to banish that consciousness of sex which is inimical to purity of mind."

"My theory is that since, in the ideal, man and woman are intended for mutual service, the best way of training is a training together. Daily knowledge gives truer estimates of each other and suggests the most useful means of helping one another—gives more natural and truer views of life."

"I further think there is less tendency toward what is called a 'fast life' at co-educational universities than at men's universities."

"The young woman and young man cannot avoid the quicksands of moral destruction until they know what they are and where they lie. I am convinced they best learn this through daily contact from childhood on, while under the care of judicious instruction. In this way, I am hoping that the wrongful idea of a double standard of morality for the two sexes may cease to exist. I believe it must cease to exist when men, as co-workers and co-students with women, learn a truer respect for womankind in general."

"It makes them stronger men and women: they understand each other better; judge of character better; give a higher mutual respect. It takes the simpering out of girls—the roughness out of men."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I believe it fits both young men and young women for a truer understanding of each other, and lays the foundation for a rational, generous sympathy that will make our future homes happier and tend to elevate society through the home."

"I find in many of the gisls educated in co-educational colleges a simpler and purer attitude toward men in general, than in many who have been educated otherwise. They certainly make a very superior sort of wife and mother, as I have had abundant opportunity to observe. The men who have been 'co-educated' bear the marks of it through life, I believe, in their attitude toward women. They respect them far more, they unconsciously treat them as equals, and they pay them that highest of all compliments, the compliment of being taken for granted instead of 'specially mentioned.'"

"It inculcates, though in unconscious learners, the truth that companionship is the basis of real happiness in married life."

The question of women's physical disability to study alongside of men is scarcely referred to. That nightmare seems to have been driven out when the Association published its Report on Health Statistics, in which an investigation covering some 900 cases showed that the health of college women had the advantage over that of working-girls, and also over that of women in the average walks of life. One of the three that favor separate education mentions that in women's colleges alone can arrangements be made that specially consider the health of students. Another says:

"I think that I am going to believe that with a more vigorous development for women, brought about by greater attention to hygiene and gymnastics from infancy, all thought of physical inability may be thrown to the winds, and women may march unhindered alongside of their brothers."

These are the only cases of special reference to this point.

The test question as to whether alumnæ will send their children to co-educational institutions is particularly and affirmatively answered by over 100. Of these 65 have sons or daughters, or both, to send to co-educational colleges, 29 would send them if they had them—or will when they have—and 7 would send sons but not daughters. The perfect simplicity with which these seven mothers set forth their anxiety that the co-educational system shall be preserved in order that their sons may be refined by its influence, and their willingness that the daughters of others should be offered up to make it the helpful and useful thing they believe it to be, is edifying. Sufficient reasons may be thought to have been given why so many choose to educate their sons and daughters together; yet it may be interesting to add a group of their sayings on this point:

"I am glad of the chance to assure you that all the children I have or may have shall be, and all the children I might have had should have been, co-educated from the cradle to the grave, if it lay in my power to so order it."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"One thing I am sure of: I want my boys to be manly and my girls womanly, and I think the incentive to manliness and womanliness is stronger—other things being equal—in co-educational institutions."

"I think I would not choose for a child of mine an institution that grudged to woman an equal place with man. I should fear that influence. The privileges must be given freely and liberally to both, with the thought that the best results come from the life and study together."

"There might be reasons for sending a son to Yale or Harvard; but, with standards and facilities equal, I should choose the one admitting women. I think the sons and daughters in a family should have the same advantages, and that can only be possible in a co-educational institution."

"Had I a daughter to educate who was possessed of ordinary good sense and discretion, I should not hesitate to send her to a co-educational school and should expect a symmetrical development."

"One thought as regards my son,—I want him to have a strong feeling of the dignity and real worth of women, such as he will get from seeing the conscientious worker in college, and such as many a man from Yale and Harvard knows nothing of. I want him to know and to associate daily with college women. The work together is a stimulus to both sexes. The rivalry is broad, not petty. There is a largeness about the whole system that is itself educative. We know our fellow-students better than the friends we make in any other way—hence are better able to decide upon (in the case of the daughter) and to select (in the case of the son) a life-long companion. I think that one great trouble in domestic life is due to ignorance of the contracting parties, of the character, ability, etc., of each other. It is impressed upon me more and more that I do not know any friends as thoroughly as those with whom I studied and recited daily for four years."

The letter of one of the few that favor separate education of women is quoted almost entire, as that side is not largely supported:

"I think a course in a co-educational college is less protected and agreeable, socially, for a girl, than a course in a girl's college. It is, in some respects, rather a trying ordeal. If a girl is accustomed to great social consideration and protection, she would be happier elsewhere. A girl of independent nature and self-reliance gets on very well, and the course of study is certainly more rigid in its requirements and correspondingly better worth taking.

"Logically, I see no objection to co-education; practically, it is harder for the girl than for the boy. She is thrown into a very critical atmosphere, and is made a subject for comment by the young men, in rather an unpleasant way. A home-like atmosphere, where she need be less upon her guard, would leave her more free for her studies. I do not think I should send my daughter to a co-educational institution unless she could live at home at the same time."

Another suggests that special courses of study adapted to women can be given in colleges for women. Another claims that these should be given, if necessary, in co-educational schools. Yet another says:

"If a woman becomes capable in the direction of study, I believe her capability increases proportionally to solve any life-problem that comes to her, be it dusting bric-à-brac, making bread, or caring for babies."

On the question of using the woman's college as a resort for the over-shy or for the frivolous, the following testimonies will bear:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The fact that open companionship between the sexes is allowed, makes it impossible for a weak, pleasure-loving girl to make the intellectual progress that she might if such companionship were prohibited. But I think the prohibiting of such companionship has its bad side. What such a girl really needs is a strong hand to guide her during her college course. But is such a girl to be taken into consideration at all in the higher education?"

"I confess, if I had some girls to deal with, I should feel anxious for them under any system of education; but, rather than send them to a school for girls only, I should try to give them co-educational schooling, and do my utmost to guard them indirectly; helping them to choose the best possible minds for companionship, both of men and women."

"I don't know of any good place for a frivolous girl, but I certainly wish all such would stay away from co-educational institutions."

"The girls' school too often—I will not say always, but my knowledge is not narrow—is a hotbed of silly notions, of petty deceit, and sometimes of the most scandalous vices."

"I am very sure that in women's colleges the work is apt to be either of lower grade than is arranged for men, because they are considered unequal to men in brain power, or else it is even more taxing than men would tolerate, because a certain professor recognizes that they are willing and eager students."

"At one time I was very much impressed with the sweet calming influence of a woman's college—and pictured very lovely girls coming forth from such retirement. That summer it was my fortune to meet some of these, and I have never heard such foolish talk about the boys as I heard from them. What to me was the natural, pleasant affair of every week seemed a fund for a whole afternoon's gossip, and I became entirely reconciled again to co-education."

Here is a testimony that has weight because of experiences connected with the evolution of co-education in the university in which the writer has now herself become a trustee:

"It has been the common impression that the women who attend co-educational colleges lose that delicacy which is so desirable a characteristic of the 'gentle sex.' I do not believe this to be the case, and I think the impression is largely due to the fact that the first women to invade men's colleges had to be women to whom conventionality was not the dearest thing on earth. There was opposition to be met. Timid, retiring women shrank from it; the bolder ones persevered. Now that the way has been opened, every year sees more girls of what may be called the society class—girls who have had some social culture at any rate—going to college.

This opinion hardly bears on any present difficulty, for it is almost forgotten in this country that any of the earlier adventurers thought they must be mannish if they sought the higher education; but in other countries, where tradition has gripped more tightly for exclusion, the transitional phase has shown itself, to the great dismay of advocates. In such places the good gospel ought to be sounded that, say theory what it may, incontrovertible experience shows that no university courses can draw the stars from their spheres nor yet crush the eternal womanly out of women. Men that speak the language

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that has the word "home" in it know now that the foundations of the hearthstone will not be undermined if women take university degrees. The college-bred woman, with her interest in health and physical culture, child-development and the whole science of ækology, is too much *en evidence* for doubts to be any longer entertained as to the future. The stock argument that women lose that "indefinable something" is also advanced, but is answered by one who says that this is "the best thing to lose that a woman can possess." Another says:

"Had I a daughter, I should certainly send her to a co-educational college, even though I know that she would lose some of the polish of manner which I should hope to be able to give her at home. I should consider that she would be fully compensated for such loss in the healthier tone of her views of life, her truer estimate of men, and her ability to measure herself by the real standards which obtain in a college community where men and women mingle freely in the class-room, the college debating-societies, and organizations of all kinds, social and educational."

The letters with reservations bring out some of the objections to the co-educational system as it now exists: the fact that fast men can make themselves disagreeable to women-students that are bent on work and will not notice them; the necessity of meeting immoral men in the class-room; the general lack of refinement and lack of oversight in social matters. The first two are noticed as conditions in a transitional period at a university where co-education was being introduced; the last comes strongly from the Oberlinites, who believe strongly in their method of supervision. The "Ladies' Department" method receives reprobation at the hands of alumnæ, and all co-ordinate schemes seem to them to fail of the desired end, the association of men and women upon a purely intellectual and equal plane. For the defects in the system, various remedies are proposed. The fraternity adjunct is suggested by three correspondents. Another, which appears in several letters, is set forth below:

"I shall send my children to the school which most nearly approaches my ideal in this regard—the co-educational university. There is a vast difference in the desirability of these institutions as they at present exist. They all need more women on their faculties, and must have them before they fully answer the need of the times. It is not difficult now to find women who are the peers of most of the men who are members of our college faculties; and I think that as college women we ought to insist that women shall be given positions in sufficient numbers to make the womanly influence felt throughout the universities. To this end women must have full standing—that is, full professorships—not subordinate positions."

"The university about which I know the most is not what it ought to be, and never will or can be this until there are women teachers and professors who are regarded in every way the equals and entitled to the same respect and honor as the male professors."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"I do not believe that such immorality as now exists in our universities would exist if half the instruction or a much less share than half was given by women. I cannot express how deeply I feel upon this subject. Women should be on the Board of Trustees, or Regents, as well as men. They should have men as well as women in their classes, and women should draw out the finest regard—affection even—in their classes, from young men as well as from young women."

A note from a recent investigation on professorships held by women in co-educational universities, made by Mrs. Marx of Palo Alto, California, might be interpolated here. She finds that, as members of the general instructing body without special executive duties connected with the women students, there are women professors at the Universities of Minnesota and Nebraska (one each), and a woman is acting professor at Northwestern. An assistant professor is found at Minnesota, Iowa, Chicago, and Leland Stanford, Jr., Universities, and 28 instructors are found at these and other institutions to the number of 11. Three universities have women professors that have executive duties connected with women students, and four have women professors in their schools of medicine or other professional schools. Women are being occasionally found useful also on boards of trustees, where their advent usually means better ventilation of college halls, more refined appointments in students' waiting-rooms, and hygienic cooking for university commons, as well as the devotion to libraries and foundations, of the fortunes to which they sometimes fall heir.

The most enthusiastic advocates of the co-educational system can yet see where it does not meet the ideal. One alumna whose father had been professor in two co-educational universities, herself a graduate of one of the foremost, and afterward a professor in one of the largest women's colleges, and again intimately associated with two other universities for men and women together, speaks most wisely:

"The present form of co-education is not ideal, but the principle is. . . . And every generation of college-bred mothers brings the ideal—*i.e.*, co-education universally—nearer."

On the defects in the system she says:

"In observing co-educational institutions you will notice that the atmosphere of co-education is generated by the manners of the community in which it exists. . . . The excessive freedom of manners, the crudeness of social life, the sentimentality, the vulgarity even, and the love-making for which co-education is held responsible, is inevitable in communities where such qualities are predominant among mature people. This has given rise to much undiscriminating criticism of the results of co-education. . . . The difficulties and failures of co-education are, in my opinion, less dangerous than the undue emphasis of sex, the stimulation of the imagination, the wholly unnatural views of life, which are produced in women's (and I believe also in men's) colleges."

"Co-education gives a natural gradual growth into knowledge of the world

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and men. To my mind the worst thing women have to contend with is ignorance—of themselves, of the nature of men, of the world's ways. Grace, culture, ideals, our girls may get from the women's colleges, but rarely that wisdom which makes them safe in the difficult choices of life."

The writer last quoted belongs in a group of 29 whose letters merit special attention because of the opportunity the writers have had for comparison. In this list are found those that added to their own college experience observations as student or instructor in some woman's college, or as wife of president or professor in some college for men alone, or who were otherwise specially qualified to give an opinion. But one of these has had her faith in the advisability of co-education modified by her experience after graduation, but she gives no reasons. I quote her strongest passage:

"Until within the last two or three years I have been an uncompromising advocate of co-education, but have lately come to feel that for some, especially young women, the separate college is best."

Among the others, a graduate of 1874 says:

"At a distance of twenty years from college days I am prepared to affirm, as at earlier periods, my unqualified approval of co-education. Unhappily I have no children to educate, but if I did I should wish them placed in mixed schools. I believe in the system, in the first place, because it is the family system. The home seems to me to furnish the divine pattern for all institutions. It is not good for man to be alone—certainly not any better for the half-grown than for the full-grown man. My experience as a student was entirely favorable to co-education. Subsequently, as a teacher, this view was strengthened. During the last five years my immediate knowledge of the life of several thousand young men and women has convinced me more fully than ever of the wisdom of the principle. The perils incident to college life seem to me to be materially lessened by co-education, and the advantages correspondingly increased. Under this system young men improve in manners and morals; they attain a wholesome respect for ability and character in women, and their ideals of womanly excellence are raised: young women are less liable to hysterical and sentimental affections; they get more sensible notions of life; they develop a more inquiring turn of mind, with less readiness to accept the statements of text-book or teacher on mere authority and repeat the same in parrot fashion; they acquire greater breadth of view and strength of purpose. It is certainly an abnormal condition that excludes young people of either sex from the companionship of the other at the very period when they most desire each other's society. The boys and girls who need to be so excluded have been badly brought up at home. As respects these cases, and indeed many really worthy young people who have been kept in seclusion, the follies, frivolities, and excesses into which they fall when restraints are removed, show by the force of reaction the unnaturalness of the separation. The match-making incident to co-education is to some a serious objection, but, to my thinking, this is one of the advantages of the system. In view of my own experience and a large range of observation on this point I very naturally think colleges the best possible places for the formation of friendships resulting in happy marriages. The opportunities for knowing the tastes, aims, and purposes, habits of life and thought of fellow-students are so many and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

varied, that deception is scarcely possible, while the community of interest attained in the common pursuit of truth under helpful and inspiring influences assures a broad and safe basis for the truest and best life unions. It has been my observation that persons trained in co-educational colleges are more generally broad-minded and well-balanced on social and moral questions than those trained in colleges for men or women alone. They know people better. They have had more and better opportunities to know them."

From the wife of a college president:

"After years of observation and thought on the subject I find myself a firm believer in co-education. If I had a dozen sons and daughters I should educate them all at co-educational colleges."

From a physician:

"I believe in co-education both in the light of reason and of personal experience. I have two daughters and one son. These shall be educated in co-educational institutions from start to finish, with my husband's approval, himself educated at men's schools. We have never been able to discover any difference in the character of their minds, nor any indications of a sudden transformation in this character at a definite period, making it desirable that one should be educated only with its own sex. We believe that both men and women trained at co-educational institutions have broader ideas, a stronger mental grasp, more unprejudiced opinions, than those trained at one-sex institutions."

From a professor:

"Having had experience as pupil and teacher in country schools and academies where both sexes were together, and in a boarding-school and a college for women only, and again in a co-educational institution, I can say this, that nothing would induce me to teach in a woman's college; that classes of women alone are wholly unsatisfactory, much more so than classes of men alone; and that the best work is done when a class can see a subject from both the masculine and feminine point of view."

They say that if you want to find the very hotbed of co-educational enthusiasm, go to the faculties of the women's colleges! It is a fact, noticed by one correspondent, that most of the women professors, both there and in other institutions, have been educated under the co-educational system. One of these well-qualified observers says:

"The experience that has made me a firm believer in co-education was a year spent as teacher in a woman's college. It seemed to me then, as it seems to me now, that, whatever the evils of co-education, they do not compare with the evils of the colleges exclusively for women. As for the peculiar dangers of co-education, the possible falling in love, etc., I think it no objection at all. While a few girls get into silly entanglements or 'flirtations,' they are girls who in a woman's college would be having hysterical passions for some woman teacher or upper-class girl. In the majority of cases the friendships between men and women students are on a high level, founded on mutual intellectual and æsthetic tastes. Where marriages result from these friendships, they are far more likely to be happy than the average marriage in the world where the attraction has not so fine a foundation."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the same subject, another, who has experience as professor in one woman's college and has lived in three universities, in one of which she is now a professor, makes it one of her three reasons for being in favor of co-education, that—

—"the sum of human happiness is increased by co-educational marriages. I have known many professors whose wives were their college mates. From my general observation of this class of marriages they seem to me the happiest that I know. My own experience leads me to feel that the more thoroughly a woman has entered into the social and intellectual life of her world, the richer her married life may be."

The question of the co-educational marriage, it is cheering to notice, has its full share of attention in the correspondence. Sixteen mention the fact that they have united in marriage with a college mate, and the exclamation has usually a note of jubilancy unmistakably spontaneous. One adds naïvely, "But I assure you this does not bias my opinion!" Brave woman! Had her own marriage been unhappy, she would still have believed in co-education! A seventeenth, after declaring that she has never seen any reason for altering her favorable opinion of the system under which she was educated, has to add, "But the children will probably go to separate schools, as their father does not believe in co-education."

One who, after graduation, taught at a woman's college and then became the wife of the head of a school for boys in connection with a college for men alone, where she has opportunity for observation, and who besides has the ideal family of two sons and two daughters, gives testimony of no uncertain sound. She says:

"Every year's added experience of life make me more in favor of the steady, healthy, sensible, many-sided training one gets in co-education. Life at the woman's college that I know well is feverish, nervous, hurried, wearing, almost sensational compared with life at my alma mater. Life there is more sedate, composed, leisurely. A woman graduating there is better prepared, I believe, for the trials and duties of wifehood and motherhood, both mentally and physically—and I do not think she is behind her sister from the woman's college in moral stamina."

The experience of one affords a point of comparison:

"I believe that, the more freedom between the sexes, the more normal will their relations to each other seem, and the natural and legitimate craving for the society of the opposite sex is met with and fulfilled under the most purifying circumstances. I attended for one year a university where the girls were rigidly kept apart, and the clandestine meetings and shameful escapades were numerous. Nothing similar occurred at my alma mater; there no limit was put on the acquaintance of the sexes, though I know of very many delightful and happy marriages resulting therefrom, to which circumstances I may thank my own. And this last point may be enlarged a little. I can imagine no happier

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

union than that of the college-bred; those with a common acquaintance, common aims, similar ambitions,—equality, in fact, of the highest type,—are best fitted to form the highest type of a home where mother as well as father shall know how to lead the way and open up the path for their little ones to collegiate and useful lives. I surely want my boy to choose as a life companion an equally educated, capable, sensible person as himself, and know of no way in which the result may come about so well as in association with such in college halls."

A fair summing up of the opinions expressed in the letters of these thoughtful women would seem to be that co-education in its ideal form offers the best advantages to both men and women, intellectually, socially, morally, and physically; but that, because of the imperfect development of human beings, this ideal form nowhere exists as yet; that, under present conditions, there are serious difficulties under both systems, but that these difficulties are more likely to be advantageously met in the long run under the system of co-education than in separate schools. Probably all the ladies addressed would, if directly asked, agree that it is well, in the present still transitional state of the history, that all experiments should be tried; that the separate and the co-ordinate, the free-and-easy and the supervised—every form and variation—should be brought forth, until we prove all things and are able to hold fast that which is best. Surely we are going slowly enough for thorough testing, as many, many women know to their sorrow; yet the gain may be in the end more certain for the delay. A chivalrous gentleman once said that rather than see one woman lose her feminine bloom he would have all women swept out of college halls. In answer to this it might be said that if, through the presence of women in university halls, many generations of men are made to have a nobler regard, not only for the women that are dear to them, but also for womankind in general, for the ideal womanhood however embodied, and if, through this heightening and broadening of their natures, they come to see that a scheme of life that, as now all over the world, sacrifices a certain portion of womankind in order to keep others in cloistered possession, is unchivalrous and vicious to the last degree and must be abolished,—then perhaps the mannishness of a few at the start will be forgiven. But it is not contemplated that any one's bloom shall be sacrificed. There are indications enough to warrant an opinion that this is not necessary. And therefore we can proceed the more joyously.

Too much, however, must not be claimed for a consensus like the one here gathered. Something must be abstracted for loyalty to alma mater, something for the influence of environment in forma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive years. Then the one hundred and thirty may not be thought to be sufficiently representative of the universities in the association, and they again of the larger body of alumnæ of other institutions. Here, too, is another point to be guarded. The great prosperity of the four great colleges for women has led some to think that the separate education for girls would be the chosen of the people. An examination of the whole field will throw some light upon this. Some two years ago a computation was made, based on Commissioner Harris' reports for 1883–84, which showed that at that date there were in colleges and universities in the United States about 60,000 women students. The list included that glorious army of aspiring lesser colleges not acknowledged by the educationally elect, and it did not include some of the universities where the reports did not distinguish the sex of students. But by the aid of the moderate guesses of some educational experts, and by keeping very much within bounds, an estimate was made which may be considered fairly correct. Of these 60,000 it was found that about 10,000 were in colleges for women alone. Since a very large proportion of this 10,000 is made up from the crowded registers of Vassar, Wellesley, Smith, and Bryn Mawr, plausibility seems to be given to the theory mentioned above; but where are the other 50,000? They are of course in the colleges for men and women together, whose name is legion, and whose towers are seen behind every hill-top in Ohio, and from afar on the rolling prairie of Iowa, and scattered over the plains of Nebraska, and beyond the high mountains, even to the utmost sea. It was the great principle of economy that set the boys and girls together on the bench in the country school-house in the days of our New England forefathers and foremothers, and it is the same saving and natural principle that has crept in everywhere in the more advanced education. The ninth generation from 1622, pilgrimaging westward nowadays and settling on the central plains, could not afford to send their daughters "back east" to school, and by the time they could found their little colleges, every sect for itself, and each college in most cases a preparatory school, college, and seminary combined, they had got along far enough to give boys and girls a chance together that was at least somewhere near to equal. The evolution in each case is a story by itself and has usually its tragic chapters. Looking over the whole ground, economy seems to have been, here as elsewhere, one of the best servants of enlightenment.

MARTHA FOOTE CROW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HEALTH OF BOSTON AND PHILADELPHIA.

In articles on Municipal Sanitation in Washington and Baltimore and in New York and Brooklyn, published in The Forum for August and November, 1893, attention was called to the great differences between the death-rates of different races, and to the importance of taking these differences into account when trying to ascertain why the death-rate of a particular locality is unusually high or low. In this paper it is proposed to consider the vital statistics of Boston and Philadelphia from the same points of view, that is, using average death-rates derived from the data obtained by the Eleventh United States Census for the six years ending May 31, 1890.

The density of population of each city on June 1, 1890, is shown by the following table:

	Population	Acres	Dwellings	Persons per acre	Persons per dwelling
Boston.....	448,477	23,041	52,669	19.46	8.52
Philadelphia...	1,046,964	82,810	187,052	12.64	5.60

Boston was therefore decidedly the more densely populated, but the comparison of "persons per acre" is not a fair one, owing to the large amount of almost rural district included within the municipal limits of Philadelphia,—as, for example, in Ward 23, which contained 27,081 acres, or a little more than one-third of the total area of the city excluding parks and cemeteries, and had an average population of only 1.30 persons to the acre. A larger proportion of the business population lived outside the city limits in the case of Boston than in that of Philadelphia. The average altitude of Boston is 70 feet, of Philadelphia 129 feet; and in a general way it may be said that the higher the altitude of a ward in either city the lower was its death-rate; but this influence is often dominated by the presence of a greater or less proportion of children, or of persons of Irish descent predisposed to consumption and pneumonia. More than 65 per cent of the population of Boston live at an altitude less

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than 30 feet; while in Philadelphia only 23.4 per cent live on this low level.

A large part of the area within the municipal limits of Boston is "made-ground," including what is known as the "Back Bay area," on which are some of the best houses in the city. The material used for filling this particular portion was clean gravel, but in other parts the filled ground contains much rubbish, and probably exerts some injurious effect upon the health of the inhabitants.

During the six-year period the average annual death-rate in Boston, excluding still births, was 23.59, and in Philadelphia 21.86 per 1,000 of mean population. For the census year alone the death rates per 1,000 were, for Boston, 23.44; for Philadelphia, 21.29,—being increased in each city by an epidemic of influenza. Furthermore the death-rate of Boston was higher than that of Philadelphia each year from 1871 to 1890.

As a general rule the larger a city the greater its death-rate, London being the most marked exception; but in the case now before us the smaller city has the higher death-rate. Why is this? That it was not due to the presence of a greater proportion of children and old people (who have high death-rates), is shown by the following table, from which it will be seen that the death-rates in Boston were absolutely higher at these ages than they were in Philadelphia:

	UNDER 5 YEARS OF AGE		65 YEARS AND UPWARD	
	Per 100,000 population	Death-rate per 1,000	Per 100,000 population	Death-rate per 1,000
Boston	8,919	87.17	3,813	94.68
Philadelphia	9,919	75.95	3,895	89.01

It has been shown in previous articles[1] that, in cities, the death-rate of the colored inhabitants is higher than that of the whites, and that the death-rate of certain of the white races—as, for example, of Irish adults or Italian children—is much higher than of that of other races, such as English or Germans. We cannot, however, compare Boston and Philadelphia as to details of race mortality in the manner that was done for New York and Brooklyn, because in Philadelphia the birthplace of the father and mother of the decedent is not regis-

[1] See THE FORUM, Vol. XV. pp. 303, 727 (May and August, 1893); Vol. XVI. p. 346 (November, 1893).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tered as it is in Boston and New York. The Philadelphia health authorities register only the birthplace of the person who dies, and this is not at all sufficient to show differences in the mortality of the white races, because all the children born in this country of Irish, German, and other foreign mothers are recorded as native Americans. In Boston the death-rate of the whites whose mothers were born in the United States was 21.30; in Philadelphia the death-rate of the whites born in the United States was 25.17,—the higher rate in the latter city being due simply to the much larger proportion of children contained in the group under consideration.

The proportion of colored population in Philadelphia was 38.5 per 1,000, or twice as great as in Boston, where it was 19.1, and the death-rate of the colored was, as usual, higher than that of the whites in each city, being 31.25 in Philadelphia, and 31.92 in Boston: hence the higher average death-rate in Boston was not due to its colored population. The proportion of foreign-born inhabitants in the population of Boston, June 1, 1890, was 349 per 1,000, while in Philadelphia it was 256, and this difference was no doubt in part the cause of the difference in death-rates of the two cities. Of the population of Boston, 160,733, or 35.8 per cent, were Irish, and 45,450 were Canadians. In Boston the death-rate of those whose mothers were born in Ireland was 27.27; of those whose mothers were born in Canada, 20.37; of those whose mothers were born in Germany, 17.17. If we take only those fifteen years of age and upward, the death-rates for Boston and Philadelphia are as follows:

	Irish	Scotch	American	English	German	French	Canadian	Hungarian	Bohemian	Scandinavain	Italian
Boston.....	24.12	14.95	14.79	13.62	13.52	12.91	10.73	10.42	9.49	8.88	8.29
Philadelphia.....	19.43	9.30	17.57	10.65	14.70	9.61	6.82	2.42	2.07	4.08	8.93

These rates for the two cities are not directly comparable, for reasons given above; but they indicate the powerful influence of race on mortality in each city.

Regarding the death-rates in different parts of these cities, the variation in Boston was from 33.14 in Ward 8, to 15.06 in Ward 11; and in Philadelphia, from 33.87 in Ward 4, to 16.45 in Ward 28. The causes of these great differences cannot be here discussed; they are partially indicated in a special report of the United States Census

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Office, soon to be published; but the following comparisons may serve as a partial illustration:

Boston	Population	Persons per acre	Under 15 years, per cent	Irish	Canadians	DEATH-RATE PER 1,000				
						Under 5 years	Irish, 15 years and over	Consumption	Pneumonia	Diphtheria
Ward 8 (*a*)	13,026	180.9	24.5	5,304	1,020	129.9	34.7	6.7	3.0	2.0
Ward 11 (*b*)	21,660	51.0	12.5	4,610	2,208	82.8	13.58	1.9	1.3	.06

(*a*) A low-lying water-side district, in an old part of the city, largely filled ground.

(*b*) A low-lying water-side district, originally a marsh, occupied mainly by a well-to-do class.

The conditions which mainly produced the marked difference in mortality in the two wards appear to have been the density of population, the proportion of children and of persons of Irish descent in the population, and relative poverty; while water-supply, subsoil water-levels, and sewerage had nothing to do with it, and the sanitary condition of the streets very little.

Philadelphia	Population	Persons per acre	Under 15 years, per cent	Colored	Foreign-born whites	DEATH-RATE PER 1,000				
						UNDER 5 YEARS		Consumption	Pneumonia	Diphtheria
						White	Colored			
Ward 4 (*c*)	20,384	140.6	31.4	2,592	8,752	99.3	215.3	4.4	3.0	1.6
Ward 28 (*d*)	46,390	14.6	31.4	663	11,055	52.5	90.6	1.9	1.3	0.8

(*c*) A low-lying district, one of the oldest sections of the city, containing many small streets, courts, and alleys, and a poor and unclean class of people.

(*d*) Situated at an average altitude of 119 feet; the buildings are neat and well-arranged; the residents are chiefly merchants, clerks, and well-to-do mechanics.

The conditions producing the heavier death-rate in Ward 4 were density and character of population, poverty, and uncleanliness; the typhoid-fever death-rate was below the city average in both wards; and the water-supply had nothing to do with the difference in the gross death-rates. The sewerage and house-drainage were in better condition in Ward 28 than in Ward 4, but it is not probable that this had any effect on the consumption and pneumonia death-rates.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us now consider briefly some of the causes of death in the two cities, as shown in the following table:

	PER 10,000 OF POPULATION			PER 100,000 OF POPULATION			
	Consumption	Pneumonia	Typhoid fever	Alcoholism	Child-birth and puerperal fever (a)	Accidents and injuries	Suicide
Boston	38.7	22.	3.9	18.	46.59	97	11
Ward 8	67.2						
Philadelphia	29.8	16.4	6.9	9.26	24.58	80	9

(a) Women between 15 and 45 years of age.

Climatic conditions no doubt had something to do with the differences as regards consumption and pneumonia; but the greater proportion of persons of Irish descent in Boston was also a cause, and the proportion of infected houses was probably greater in Boston than in Philadelphia. The low proportion of tenement-houses in Philadelphia, and the fact that in that city each family as a rule occupies a separate dwelling, has a powerful influence in reducing its mortality. The figures for typhoid fever indicate a more polluted water-supply for Philadelphia than for Boston. Diphtheria, measles, whooping-cough, cancer, and heart-disease were more fatal in Boston, but the differences in death-rates due to these diseases are insignificant in comparison with those due to consumption and pneumonia. The returns for alcoholism are much below the true rates, yet it is quite probable that alcoholism is nearly twice as fatal in Boston as in Philadelphia in proportion to population. The difference in the fatalities of childbirth and puerperal fever in Boston is probably due to the character of the population, and to the fact that a larger proportion of cases of labor are there attended by midwives than is the case in Philadelphia. The difference in the suicide-rate is due to a greater proportion of adult foreigners in Boston, and a greater proportion of colored people in Philadelphia, the suicide-rate among the latter class being always lower than it is among the whites.

A study of these and other statistics relating to the causes of death in the two cities leads to the conclusion that the persistently higher death-rate in Boston as compared with that of Philadelphia for the last twenty years has been due mainly to diseases of the lungs, and more especially to consumption and pneumonia, and that this excessive fatality from these diseases is due, to a considerable extent, to the race-characteristics and density of the population.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The density of population affects the death-rates from diseases of this kind, partly because it increases the liability to contract diseases from infected houses, but mainly through the poverty, ignorance, uncleanliness, and alcoholic habits which characterize the majority of the tenement-house class. It has been shown in the paper on New York and Brooklyn [1] that all of these conditions together may be dominated by race characteristics, and that some of the most crowded districts in New York, inhabited by a poor and unclean class of people, have low death-rates because these people are of the Jewish race; but the number of this class is not sufficient in any ward in either Boston or Philadelphia to produce such a lowering of the death-rate in that ward as to be especially noticeable. The differences between the two cities as to climatic conditions no doubt produce some differences in the death-rates; but these differences in the aggregate are not large, for the extra mortality in the winter months in Boston, due to diseases of the respiratory organs, is to some extent counterbalanced by an extra mortality in Philadelphia during the summer months, due to diarrhœal diseases in children, and by the greater liability to malarial disease in the latter city.

In Boston the lowest death-rate was in June; in Philadelphia in September; in both cities the highest death-rate was in July, owing to the mortality among children under five years of age, which in Boston was 104.08, and in Philadelphia 132.02.

The longer and colder winters in Boston increase the death-rate mainly by causing the poorer classes to huddle in ill-ventilated rooms for the sake of warmth; the higher and more continuous summer temperatures in Philadelphia increase the death-rate of little children mainly by promoting the growth of certain forms of bacteria whose products are especially irritating to the intestinal canal, but also by the direct action of the heat upon the nervous system.

The average daily consumption of water per head was, for Boston about 89 gallons, for Philadelphia 111 gallons,—the Boston supply being the freest from excremental pollution. The number of saloons to each 1,000 persons was, in Boston 1.33, in Philadelphia 1.15. The sewer system of Boston was in better condition than that of Philadelphia, but there were a number of privy-vaults and cesspools in Boston also, and during the year 1890 about 1,300 of these were reported as having been cleansed and repaired, and 784 as having been abolished. In Philadelphia over 3,500 privy-wells were reported as more or less of a nuisance during the year 1890.

[1] THE FORUM, Vol. XVI. p. 348 (November, 1893).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Boston the Board of Health is a separate department, reporting directly to the mayor; in Philadelphia it is one of the bureaus subordinate to the Department of Public Safety. The Boston Board, in 1890, expended $52,643.14 in its work, exclusive of $15,890 on public baths, and $16,514.43 on quarantine. The Philadelphia Board spent about $90,000 in its work, besides about $20,000 on quarantine. The items are not fully comparable, but Boston expends considerably more than Philadelphia upon its sanitary work in proportion to its population. This should be the case, in view of the number of its tenement-house class, but neither Board has a sufficient number of inspectors to do the work required of it.

Taking into consideration the fact that the annual tax levy for all purposes in Boston is over $11,000,000, and in Philadelphia over $13,000,000, it would seem that $100,000 for Boston and $150,000 for Philadelphia would be a judicious minimum annual expenditure upon the Health Department. Heretofore Boston has expended more than Philadelphia upon sanitary engineering works, and this appears in the indebtedness per capita—which is for Boston $62.82 and for Philadelphia $28.29. Recently, however, Philadelphia has expended several millions of dollars upon street and other improvements which were badly needed, and many of which will have a good influence upon the public health.

Boston has an excellent hospital for cases of such diseases as diphtheria and scarlet fever, giving the Health Department facilities for their isolation. Philadelphia is not thus provided, although it has a good smallpox hospital. The summer public bath-houses in both cities are much used in warm weather, and are important sanitary institutions, but there are no public wash- and bath-houses for use during the winter months. Each city has a quarantine establishment that is fairly well equipped, and will probably be sufficient to meet the demands made upon it. The Philadelphia quarantine is now secondary to the United States quarantine lower down the Delaware, which is a good arrangement, especially as regards protection from yellow fever. Although the death-rate of Philadelphia is below that of Boston, it is probable that by the aid of sanitary engineering more can be done toward lowering the death-rate of the former city than can be done for the latter.

Philadelphia has the immense sanitary advantage of having the great majority of its families supplied each with a separate house; and if it can obtain a fairly pure water-supply, and a properly planned

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and well-constituted system of sewerage, it should be possible to maintain its death-rate for a series of years at about 18 per 1,000, while it is not probable that the death-rate of Boston can be brought, by such means, below 21 per 1,000 for more than a year or two at a time. The causes of disease and death which the health authorities of Boston can probably attack with the most hope of good results are consumption and pneumonia, and this is to be done largely by educating the class most affected by these diseases as to the comparatively simple measures required to check their spread, and by aiding in the thorough disinfection of houses, rooms, clothing, and bedding infected by their germs. Something may also be done in the same direction in certain districts in Philadelphia. Many people now understand more or less clearly the utility of limiting the spread of the bacillus of tubercle, and the means of doing it; but it is not generally known that the micrococcus of pneumonia also infects certain overcrowded and ill-kept rooms, and that its spread may be limited by measures analogous to those used for tuberculosis.

Diphtheria is another disease which may be greatly lessened in each of these cities by proper precautions and treatment; but to effect much in this direction the means at the command of the Boards of Health must be considerably increased, to enable them to make a prompt and accurate diagnosis in doubtful cases, and to secure isolation and proper care in those cases which will receive such care in their own houses. Philadelphia should add to its form of death registration the item of birthplace of parents of the decedent, and should by all possible means maintain its present relative exemption from tenement-houses. It can, more easily than any other large city in this country, enforce stringent regulations upon tenement-house owners and lodgers to secure light, ventilation, abundant water-supply, satisfactory drainage, and cleanliness in such houses, and if by doing this it makes the owning and renting of foul rookeries unprofitable, and drives from the city the class of people whose habits and needs make it profitable, it will be pursuing a wise policy.

The man who lives in his own house in Boston has as long an expectation of life for himself and his family as the man under similar circumstances in Philadelphia, since the specially unfavorable sanitary conditions in the former city affect chiefly the tenement-house population, and can only be improved by municipal action tending to scatter and disperse that population, which action probably cannot now be taken in that city. JOHN S. BILLINGS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE KIND OF MONEY THAT WOULD RULE THE WORLD.

THAT there is a safe coinage system, one applicable to our own country and equally suited to all others, ought to be suspected, even if not fully believed, by intelligent people. The supply of metals suitable for coinage which nature furnishes, and the disposition of all peoples to use them in the shape of coin, indicate that under reasonable legislation they can be made available for currency-uses up to the full extent of the needs of domestic business or international trade.

I think few if any readers of THE FORUM need to be argued with to induce them to subscribe to the doctrine that two unlimited legal-tender metals can no more occupy the field at one time than can any two things occupy precisely the same space at the same time. That bimetallism with free and unlimited coinage of both gold and silver at a fixed ratio with full legal-tender attributes is a possible thing, is, among thinking and reading people, an idea of the past. That in our day and age, or in any period in the near future, any number of nations can by combination do what the United States cannot do, is still believed by some, and indeed by a large and intelligent body of thinkers; but their number is decreasing, and faith in what is known as international bimetallism (*i.e.*, the unlimited legal-tender coinage of both gold and silver at a fixed ratio by international agreement) is waning. It is a safe prediction that successful domestic bimetallism under the general plan believed in by Mr. Bland, Mr. Peffer, Mr. Coxey, and many other gentlemen of more or less intelligence, will never command anything like the support it has had in the past. Worthy men, honest people, and very good citizens still believe in the early discovery of mechanical perpetual motion, and members of this general family of thinkers will undoubtedly continue to preach the unlimited free coinage of legal-tender gold and silver at the ratio of 1 to 16; but the people who read books and practically master the every-day methods of business will hereafter train in quite another crowd. General Walker and President Andrews have a highly respectable class of followers both here and in Europe, but it is also a safe prediction that one practical experiment will shatter and destroy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their existing belief, faith, or hope, in making Blandism successful by extending its field.

There is, however, a safe, sane, and easy system of unlimited coinage open to the United States and to the world, and I venture, therefore, to call it a perfect coinage system.

Not the least of its merits is its simplicity and naturalness. Its application to our present situation is so easy, and its capacity for meeting every possible condition or commercial exigency which may hereafter arise is so complete, as to require only a plain and brief statement to make its advantages apparent and its acceptance by thinking people general if not universal. The plan is strictly to limit the work of coinage by the government of gold and silver bullion owned by individuals, firms, and corporations, to measuring and stamping the weight and fineness of the coins. How readily this can be done is perhaps best shown by printing here the brief and clear text of a bill now before the proper committee of Congress, and known as House Bill No. 5,941, copies of which may be obtained by writing to any member of the House or Senate:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on and after the passage of this act the mints of the United States shall be opened to the coinage of both silver and gold, upon the same terms as existed prior to eighteen hundred and seventy-three: *provided, however,* that no silver or gold coined hereafter for the account of the owners shall be a legal tender, and instead of being stamped "one dollar," "five dollars," "ten dollars," and so forth, it shall be stamped "one globe," "five globes," "ten globes," and so forth, and on the reverse side every piece of such coin shall bear the words "not a legal tender."

Sec. 2. That nothing in this act shall be construed as taking away the legal-tender function of any silver or gold already coined.

If the author of the bill were to admit that he has no immediate expectation that it or anything like it will become law, this admission would not weaken the truth of the principle involved, nor lessen the certainty that in the course of the coming century this bill, or some other embodying this very principle, will be the law of the United States and of every other leading commercial nation in the world.

The perfection of coinage will be reached when we have at all times as much metallic currency in circulation as we can use to advantage, and when the coin is divided into gold and silver in a proportion which fully meets the demands and needs of trade. If this bill were law, both these results would follow without shock, jar, or danger. It is for this reason that I have called it a perfect system. Test it by applying it to the past. Suppose this bill had become the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law in 1873, and had continued down to the present moment, and that the Bland-Allison and Sherman laws had never been enacted. We should for these twenty-one years have had automatically and without government interference an ample supply of both gold and silver coin, and in the precise proportion required by trade. Instead of this we have bought a mountain of useless silver at a cost of $464,210,263, which at the present market value would, if sold, bring but $289,766,422, involving a clear loss of $174,443,841, and in addition to this tremendous loss (which is much less than the actual sum that a forced or even rapid sale of our useless silver coin and bullion would entail) we have not only suffered the untold losses of the panic, but we have driven away, by the hundreds and perhaps thousands of millions, foreign capital already invested, and which, but for our silver folly, would have been invested in the United States.

Under this bill the United States would have coined for its own account enough silver bullion to furnish, say, *one dollar in the shape of a standard dollar for each inhabitant*, which would have been an ample supply; and the balance of our silver production would have been sold, and the proceeds brought back to us in the shape of gold or goods, which as raw materials or manufactured products would have gone into our consumption or manufactures; and instead of the people of the United States losing the vast shrinkage of nearly two hundred millions of dollars in the market price of our useless store of silver, this loss would have been distributed all over the world. As all the gold "globes" coined under such a law would have the same value as our gold dollars, the gold coinage would have been enormously increased, and to-day our currency would be not only ample in volume but the soundest and best in the world.

So much for the past; but, since we cannot remedy its errors, let us apply this bill to the future. Suppose it were to become a law to-morrow, what would follow? This is the practical question. In the first place not a dollar of existing currency, gold, silver, or paper, would be disturbed, and if we had any need of more coin, both silver and gold bullion would flow to our mints until such need was filled, and then it would stop of its own accord, and not by act of Congress or through regulation of the Treasury. If we needed less after a while, the surplus would reach the melting-pot or be exported in the shape of coin, and our market would be relieved of it in the same manner and for the same reason that wheat is exported. Whenever our people required more metallic money, the stream of bullion would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again flow into our mints and out again in the shape of coin, so that safely and by absolutely natural means we should enjoy a financial millennium, when the supply and demand for coined money would meet and march together.

Observe, too, that nobody would be cheated; for the "globe" would pass at its actual value, just as the owner of labor or of wheat or of manufactured goods passes (sells) his property. Gold "globes" would be current in the United States and everywhere else alongside the legal-tender gold dollar, while silver "globes" would also command their real and therefore proper value. The justice of such a law is plain, for it gives gold no advantage over silver, and the owner of gold or silver bullion no advantage over the owner of any other commodity. The unlimited coinage of *legal-tender* silver, on the other hand, would enable one citizen with his 45 or 50 cents' worth of property (silver bullion) to pay off any obligation given in exchange for 100 cents' worth of the labor, product, or property of his neighbor.

But, asks some one who is more or less a victim to the idea that the legal-tender quality is necessary to make coin or paper a useful money, "What would you do for a legal tender?" The answer is very plain. This bill would not destroy the legal-tender quality of the legal-tender money now in circulation ($22.50 per capita), nor prevent the government from coining *on its own account* additional legal tender. But, as an average supply of one dollar of *legal tender* currency per capita (*i.e.* $68,032,000) would probably be ample, and since we now have more than $1,500,000,000 of legal-tender currency, it is easy to see that very many generations of men would pass before the volume of legal tender would become a burning question.

It is proper to say that no silver "globes" would be coined, for the very obvious reason that under this law no silver or gold would be coined unless actually needed to supply the current and legitimate wants of business. Since we now have eight times as much silver in the shape of coin (dollars) as we use, of course no more would be coined—except a very few silver "globes" to satisfy the curious. It is easy to see why this would be so. After silver bullion was turned into "globes," it would have only its bullion value; and with the present over-supply of legal-tender silver dollars, and because there is a constant demand for silver bullion in the arts and for export (whereas there is no demand for silver dollars), there would certainly be no demand for silver "globes." Take the case of a man owning $1,000 worth of silver bullion, which would make about

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2,000 silver "globes," and, when coined, would bring him a little less probably than in its bullion state. To put it into "globes" would cost him $10 for seigniorage, besides the expense and trouble of getting his bullion to the mint and his "globes" away from it. Few, if any, men would care to bring annoyance and loss upon themselves in order to have a stock of silver "globes" to offer on a market already oversupplied with a more acceptable coin. We have been able to keep in circulation only about one-eighth (53,525,000) of our coined silver dollars; and in conversation a little while ago, Mr. Preston, the Director of the Mint, agreed with me that not less than 30,000,000 of these rested every night in banks and trust companies, and in the safes and vaults of commercial houses and corporations, leaving actually in the pockets of the people only one silver dollar for every three of our population.

Since, however, there is a domestic and some foreign demand at all times for gold coins (the United States having coined more than thirty-four millions of gold in the past three months) it is probable that the coinage of gold "globes" would go on regularly, for they would be as desirable as gold dollars, having the same market and exchangeable value both at home and abroad. It must not be forgotten, however, that the coinage of gold "globes" (on the same principle governing silver "globe" coinage) would be controlled by the demand for gold coin for actual business purposes. Those who think that the name of the coin is important or its legal-tender quality essential should remember that the international trade of the world is carried on with coins that are not uniform in appearance or name, and with money devoid of the legal-tender quality. This being true, it is easy to see that any nation could and would readily accommodate itself to the conditions which this plan of free coinage would create.

But, again, such persons should recall the fact that from February 21, 1857, till 1878, our silver coins of large size were almost exclusively a non-legal tender, and included Mexican, Spanish, Peruvian, and other South and Central American dollars, as well as French francs and German thalers. Yet our free-coinage friends of the Bland type always point to this period as a model coinage era. However, as we already have eight times as many standard legal-tender silver dollars as we can circulate, and since the demand for silver money does not increase in any intelligent nation, like the United States, with the increase of population, it needs no argument to prove that no silver "globes" would ever actually get into circulation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in order to answer a therefore irrelevant objection, but one likely to be made, to the coinage of silver "globes," let us suppose that we awoke some morning and found that every silver dollar in circulation, as well as all the silver dollars in the Treasury (blessed thought!), had disappeared forever, and a demand—the only possible one—was thus created for silver "globes." We should then have a place for say about 120,000,000 [1] of them, and they would go into circulation as fast as they left the mint and at their actual value. Suppose, moreover, they did vary as much in the course of a year as two cents on each, what difference would it make? Such a fluctuation would not affect the market value in the small transactions in which they would be used, and in the aggregate the fluctuation could not amount to anything serious when spread over the year, in a coin not a legal tender and therefore not a standard of value or a legal and final measure for commodities. As each individual would on the average possess about one "globe" (the balance being in the hands of banks, corporations, and business houses of various kinds), the possible individual loss might reach two cents a head per annum—an utterly insignificant sum to pay for the blessing of an honest, flexible, ample supply of coined money at all times.

It must, however, be remembered that this state of affairs could not exist until an insufficient supply of standard silver dollars brought silver "globes" into actual use. Such a situation is not probable in time or likely to occur in eternity; and, if it did arise, the deficiency in supply could, if preferred, be filled by the coinage of more legal-tender silver on government account.

This article was not intended to be either long or elaborate, but simply to suggest a more intelligent consideration of the subject of coinage, and it may appropriately end with the remark that, under the system proposed, our "globe" coinage would soon come to be regarded as desirable for international purposes because of the fact that weight and fineness alone would be represented. Within a moderate number of years it is therefore reasonable to expect that balances between nations would be adjusted in the gold and silver "globes" of the United States, and that the trading world would draw its bills of exchange (partly because of the convenience of our decimal system) in "globes" instead of pounds sterling.

MICHAEL D. HARTER.

[1] It would require twice as many pieces, or 120,000,000 silver "globes," to do the work of 60,000,000 standard dollars, as the "globe" would pass at its actual value only.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GOVERNMENT'S FAILURE AS A BUILDER.

THE pretence in which some of us are fond of indulging ourselves, that the Americans are becoming an artistic people, is hard to maintain in the face of notorious facts. It seems to be a reckless generalization from the procedures and aspirations of small groups of people in half-a-dozen of the older cities. They are an inconsiderable minority even in their respective communities, as each group finds out for itself whenever it undertakes practically to appeal to the assumed interest in art of its fellow-citizens in behalf of any local cause; and of course they form an infinitesimal fraction of the whole population. A sporadic "case" of art, like the display at the World's Fair, which is plainly traceable to the wise or fortunate selection of one enlightened man as Director of Works, does not hold out any tangible promise of an æsthetic epidemic. If we set out to gauge the permanent and pervading interest in art throughout the country, we cannot do better than to consider the artistic work done under the direction of the Government, which cannot fail to represent the average of æsthetic enlightenment and culture. The Government is not only far away the greatest builder in the United States. In the past generation it has doubtless been the most extensive builder in the world. The result of its labors is the expenditure, within the last forty years, of a hundred millions of dollars upon public buildings, without taking any thought whatever what they would look like when they were done.

This is the literal fact. The last report of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department gives the total cost of the buildings in charge of the Treasury Department, exclusive of the cost of sites. Omitting those built before 1853, the report shows an aggregate expenditure for forty years of $100,357,396.61. And note that this by no means includes all the public buildings,—not even all those erected under the direction of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, but "in charge" of other Departments, such as the State, War and Navy building at Washington. It includes, indeed, none of the public buildings of the capital except the Treasury build-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing and the Post-office, now in course of erection. The War Department does its own building throughout the country. So does the Navy Department. All that are included in this enormous aggregate are the custom-houses, court-houses, post-offices, and marine hospitals, with a few miscellaneous buildings lumped in the title of the report under an "etc."

The Treasury building, with which in point of time the list begins, is almost the only building in the list, of great magnitude and costliness, that would be accepted as a creditable example of public architecture. It takes its place with dignity among the public buildings of the capital; it conforms to the highest standard that was maintained in public or in private practice at the time of its erection,—and it is the latest extensive Government building of which so much can be said; and it is the very earliest that was erected under the direction of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, who, indeed, was called into being for the purpose of supervising its erection. Yet it is not the costliest building in the list. That eminence is attained by the New York post-office, of which the cost is given at nearly one-third more, or $8,986,091.04, against $6,893,720.66. The Chicago post-office cost $5,119,804.88; the Boston post-office, $4,736,049.96; the Cincinnati post-office, $5,131,206.36; the Philadelphia post-office, $4,666,760.03; the St. Louis post-office, $5,715,119.93. Each of these buildings must be by far the costliest in its respective city. Each is in magnitude and costliness a public building of the first rank. There are thirty buildings in the list the cost of each of which exceeded $500,000. In regard to such edifices, the plea of a recent Supervising Architect—that a comparison between the public buildings of this country and of Europe was unjust because the European buildings cost more, and that comparison between the public and private architecture of this country was unjust for a like reason—becomes merely stupefying.

In order to appreciate how completely reckless the Government has been of the architectural results of its enormous expenditure in building, it is necessary to inquire how the existing state of things came about. This is the more necessary because an effort has of late been made to represent that method as the result of a careful deliberation, and as having issued in a "system," which may have its disadvantages, but which also has its advantages, as compared with other "systems" of obtaining designs for public buildings. The same Supervising Architect, who certainly does not lack courage, in speak-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of the efforts of the Institute of Architects to bring the professional skill of the country to bear upon the design of its public buildings, refers to "the system which has prevailed with such substantial and satisfactory results for many years past, and which is now in vogue." As a matter of fact, the "system" is the result of a series of hand-to-mouth expedients and makeshifts, and does not deserve to be called a system at all.

Until 1850 such building as the Government undertook, apart from the public buildings at Washington the designs for which were obtained by some form of competition, was done under the direction of the War Department, and an office was established under the charge of a major of engineers, the engineer officers being the only class of public servants who were supposed to understand construction. The major was authorized to employ architects as draughtsmen, and to each building in progress an officer was assigned as engineer-in-charge. When the extension of the Treasury building had been decided upon, the design of it was committed to Mr. Walter, who had already been chosen architect of the extension of the Capitol and directed also to design additions to the General Post-Office and to the Patent Office. Finding himself overburdened with work, the architect declined to undertake the superintendence of the Treasury extension, and the head-draughtsman in the office of the major of engineers was chosen to superintend it, and was therefore named "Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department." After the office thus came into being, the incumbent of it being the only official architect "in sight," it became convenient and customary to provide, in appropriations for new public buildings, that they should be erected under the direction of the "Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department." The architect who has for forty years had the spending of two millions and a half a year, and with it the unchallenged power to play any pranks he chose with the public architecture, and to debauch the taste of the American public from Maine to California, has been the successor and representative of the clerk-of-works of the Treasury building. With an influence much beyond that of any European Ministry of Public Works, he is a clerk, holding office at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Treasury, unrecognized by law except in the annual appropriations, and with no guarantee whatever of his professional competency, except that the Secretary of the Treasury has seen fit to appoint him. This is "the system."

It may be said that the system has worked as well as could have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been expected, and that is true. In respect to architecture, the functionary who can scarcely be said to have any statutory existence has had things all his own way. Having been chosen for such reasons as may be supposed to actuate to such an appointment a Secretary of the Treasury who presumably knows and cares neither more nor less than the ordinary American politician about the art of architecture; having no reason to look forward to any longer term than his creator enjoys, and no assurance of a term even so long, and receiving a compensation far below the income an architect of proved ability and established standing commands in private practice, a power is thrust upon him such as no other architect in the world possesses or has ever possessed. The public architecture of the country is handed over to him to work his will upon it without control or challenge. It is impossible to conceive of a more contumelious disposition than this of the claims of art upon the people of the United States, and yet this is the national estimate of the value of those claims.

The presumption that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury is not among the leaders of his profession is very strong indeed. The salary of the office, as has just been said, is too small to tempt a busy architect,—that is to say, an architect of proved ability and established standing—from private practice. It is indeed conceivable that an ambitious and patriotic architect might submit to a considerable pecuniary sacrifice, and take the place for the architectural opportunities it afforded, if the other conditions were made attractive to him. But in fact they are the reverse of attractive. The incumbent of the place has no status. He is not the head of a department, nor even of a bureau. He is the tenant-at-will of a clerkship. The term of a Secretary of the Treasury is often less than quadrennial, and the term of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury is often less than that of the Secretary who appoints him. Moreover, it is not possible for him to gratify a professional ambition. The routine duties of his office, the selection of sites, the investigation into the need of repairs, the making and enforcement of contracts, and the like, suffice to engross the time of a first-rate man of business. The responsibilities connected with these duties, being pecuniary, are real and enforceable responsibilities. The artistic responsibilities are illusory. There is not the least fear or hope that he will be held to any effective accountability on that score. It is common enough to hear busy architects complain that their duties as men of business leave them far too little time to do themselves justice as artists. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is common to see in their work proof that the complaint is well founded. But there is no architect in private practice, even the most overworked, who is necessarily so far removed from "the still air of delightful studies" as the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, or whose pursuits are so inconsistent with the practice of the art of design. The place is no more tempting to ambition than to avarice. It could not allure an architect whose ability had been proved by success in private practice, and it has often been refused by such. The architects who aspire to it might therefore be expected to be those who have either not yet succeeded in private practice or those who have definitely failed. An ambitious young architect might seek in it a field; or a disappointed architect of riper years might find in it an asylum.

Of course the appointment of one of the former class, however perilous, is more promising than the appointment of one of the latter class; but an ambitious young architect would find that the conditions of his employment were such as to frustrate the hope that in a place apparently of such unbounded power he could do the State much service or himself much credit. At least one such architect has held the place and has retired from it disappointed. Twenty years ago Mr. William A. Potter, who had then indicated and has since abundantly proved his professional ability, assumed the office. During his short service his efforts availed something to raise the standard of our public architecture and to constitute a landmark in its history. But they availed also to convince him that the "system," which its latest operators regard with so much complacency, was fatal to the hope of a worthy public architecture, and they led him to the same conclusions which the leaders of his profession have lately striven to enforce upon the present Secretary of the Treasury and to get embodied in the law. In his report for 1875 Mr. Potter says:

"I desire particularly to invite your attention to a subject which presented itself to me very shortly after my entering upon the duties of this office. I refer to the manner in which designs are prepared for the public buildings erected under the Treasury Department. These designs have heretofore been made by the Supervising Architect, and have been so made up to the present time; but the very strong reasons which present themselves against this practice have convinced me that it should be remedied as speedily as may be. . . . The vital point of any system which may be adopted must be to remove the power from the Supervising Architect to make designs, and restrict his duties simply to those of a supervisory nature. . . . The immense amount of routine work which occupies the attention of the Supervising Architect, and the fact that he is at no time free from interruption, leave him no opportunity for the proper study of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the designs he is required to make. This work is done under all the disadvantages of want of time, want of quiet, and almost entire preoccupation with other matters, which must always result in work of an imperfect and unsatisfactory character."

In accordance with this view a bill was prepared in the Treasury Department, and introduced into Congress by Mr. Hewitt, in 1876, then a Representative from New York, of which the object was precisely the same as that of the bill which last year was pushed by the American Institute of Architects, and, in a mutilated form, became law, and has now been converted into a dead letter by the refusal of the Treasury Department to give it effect. This object was to secure for the design of the public buildings the best architectural skill of the country. The earlier measure proposed to secure this by opening competitions for the design of every work of which the cost was to exceed $50,000, under the direction of the Supervising Architect, who, with four experts chosen by the Department, should select a design from among those submitted in such competitions, and should have power to award prizes amounting to not more than one-half of one per cent on the estimated cost of the work.

Thus, nearly twenty years ago, there was an official acknowledgment that the "system" had not led and could not lead to satisfactory results. This acknowledgment was made by the architect of the highest standing who has held the office since it was established, if it can be said ever to have been established, and under whom the public architecture came most nearly up to the highest standard attained in private practice. The same conclusions were reached, and again brought in official reports to the notice of the Department, by Mr. Windrim, who held the office during 1889 and 1890, and who was equally reluctant to be judged by the work that he was compelled to do under conditions so discouraging.

If a change were needed in 1875, it is far more urgently needed now, for it will not be denied by anybody who has paid attention to the artistic output of the office that it has, upon the whole, shown a progressive degeneration since the time of Mr. Potter, and indeed since the time of Mr. Mullett, who was the first of the Supervising Architects of the Treasury Department to magnify the office to the extent of assuming for it all the architectural work of the Government. Before his time, or at least when the work was done under the War Department, a single pattern was adopted for the combined post-offices and custom-houses of different cities. This military

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

method was not artistic, but there was something to be said for it. A Supervising Architect who could not undertake a new design for every public building might nevertheless have been able to furnish one typical design that was really studied and elaborated, practically as well as artistically, and that could be repeated in different places with slight variations at least without offence, except to the travellers who had encountered it elsewhere. Unfortunately the pattern that was designed by the first Supervising Architect, though it was not frivolous or vulgar and did nothing positively to debauch the taste of those who were subjected to its influence, could not possibly be called beautiful.

When Mr. Mullett was actively at work magnifying his office, it seemed quite out of the question that the time might come when he would be regretted; but that time has come. Those works of his in which he had to be tame and conventional, such as the State, War, and Navy building at Washington, in spite of the lamentable incongruity between its treatment and that of the older and simpler public buildings of the capital, the New York post-office, and the Philadelphia post-office, are very much more creditable than the works of the past decade. Even his wilder excursions, such as the Chicago post-office (of which in execution the design was modified for the better by Mr. Potter) are by no means so outrageous and irresponsible as those of his latest successors.

If the best method of obtaining designs for the Government had been considered, if the "system" were anything but a makeshift, one of the arguments in favor of a central bureau, whether its function was of design or merely of supervision, would be that it tended to give to the public architecture some fixity and continuity and tradition, and to prevent the execution in durable material of mere freaks. It is true that this tendency may be carried too far. There are not wanting French architects who maintain that it has been carried too far in France, that the official public architecture lacks flexibility and the power of adjusting itself to progress, and that all architecture tends to become official. Nothing of this kind can be alleged against or in favor of "the system." After forty years it is as bare of traditions as the architecture of a mining-camp. Every Supervising Architect does what is right in his own eyes, quite secure from official or effective criticism or control. The less discreditable works of Mr. Mullett, already mentioned, were, as nearly as he could make them, in the French official style. Mr. Potter, an enthusiastic medi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ævalist, converted the Government architecture from pseudo-classic to the Victorian-Gothic, which at that time enlisted perhaps the majority of the educated architects of the country and plausibly seemed to be the architecture of the future. Mr. Hill reverted to the pseudo-classic, which had been practised by the first Supervising Architect of the Treasury, Mr. Ammi B. Young, and which had thus gone within a measurable distance of becoming an official style, and establishing a tradition of Government architecture. Mr. Hill's own works in this manner were simple, straightforward, businesslike, decorous, and inoffensive, and were perhaps the best that could be expected from a system which excluded the possibility of careful individual design. At any rate they are much better than anything that the "system" has yielded since; and since Mr. Hill's time the degeneration has been so rapid that it is not too much to say that, for the past decade and more, the Government architecture of the United States has been more discreditable than the architectural work of any other nation in the world, civilized, half-civilized, or barbarous. The semblance of a tradition was promptly effaced. Each successive Supervising Architect has seemed to take a pride in diverging as widely as possible from his predecessors, to have aimed at "variety" and to have attained difference.

One of the obstacles—pointed out by Mr. Potter in the report already quoted from—to the production of good architecture under "the system," was the uniformity of the problems presented to the Supervising Architect. "The objects for which the buildings erected in this office are constructed are, with very slight exceptions, so nearly alike, that the difficulty, the impossibility, of endowing them with variety and individuality, must be apparent." That is to say, the problem is the satisfaction in many buildings of requirements virtually the same. When a designer has solved this problem in one instance to his own satisfaction, he must either virtually repeat his solution in another, or the alternative solution will be less satisfactory. He might present two plausible solutions, but, as the number of buildings increases, the difficulty, as Mr. Potter says, becomes an impossibility. Being the work of the same designer, the buildings must be alike or they must be unsuccessful. The only way of obtaining variety is the fatal method of varying designs for variety's sake, and adding "features" that are not called for by the requirements, and that have nothing to do with the building. The futility of this process was "apparent" to Mr. Potter as a trained and artistic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

designer, but to most of his successors it has by no means been apparent. In fact, it is evidently the process they have pursued, and which one of them has rather naïvely avowed. "In the preparation of the designs for the various buildings," observes this gentleman, "I have endeavored to avoid monotony; a difficult task to accomplish in view of the fact that the uses to which the buildings are applied are so similar." The "endeavor"— one might say the strain— is evident in the illustrations that accompany his report. It may be questioned whether a jumble "avoids monotony" by the mere fact of being a jumble; but the jumbles differ among themselves, and it is plain that difference has been the main endeavor of the design.

It is not necessary or desirable, however, to be personal in discussing "the system." An inspection of the illustrated reports of the Supervising Architects for the past ten years makes it evident that it does not matter much to the artistic quality of the product who has been at the head of the office. Upon the whole, in spite of occasional designs which indicate that, if the author had had time to work them out, they might have resulted in creditable buildings, the degeneration has been progressive, and in proportion to the increased lack of restraint that the designer felt in consequence of the profound official and public apathy as to what he did. The designs indicate, what we know to be the fact, that they were produced by an overworked architect who was mainly occupied with something else. What an overworked architect, to whose duties the art of architecture was episodical, would naturally do, would be to take "ideas," meaning features that attracted him, wherever he found them, and incorporate them in his designs without much reference to their original purpose or meaning, or to their fitness for the purpose to which he proposed to apply them, and without the opportunity, even if he had the ability, for the careful and successful adjustment of them to new relations which alone could justify such an employment of them.

This is the course that the illiterate and reckless among private practitioners of architecture are accustomed to take, and this is the course that the Supervising Architects of the United States have been taking, with increasing recklessness and apparently with increasing illiteracy. The result has been that the government buildings have become more and more "thingy," more and more compilations of "features" that fail to make up a physiognomy. The architecture is first impure and then unpeaceable. The features themselves are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

derived from all sources, ancient and modern, from the classic portico down to the newest fashion.

The late Mr. Richardson has been most extensively despoiled by successive Supervising Architects, and one wonders what he would think if he could see the use that they have made of his tower at North Easton, his tower at Pittsburg, and his design for the Art Building in Buffalo. The product of the system that is best known and that has been considered by most people is the Government Building at the World's Fair. That, in consideration of its conspicuousness and its surroundings, was an object-lesson of the first importance in the difference between artistic and inartistic architecture, and the lesson was not lost. The building was really neither better nor worse than the average of the architectural products of "the system"; but it was subjected to a cruel and unusual test. It was the contrast between it and its neighbors that roused architects to make one more attempt for the redemption of the public architecture.

By dint of unselfish and zealous effort, the American Institute of Architects secured the passage of a bill, in its purpose and the general scope of its provisions similar to that which an artistic and conscientious Supervising Architect urged twenty years before, to invoke the architectural skill of the country in the design of its public buildings by opening that design to competition. The bill was shorn of much of its force in the Senate by a provision converting the competitions into mere lotteries by stipulating that no unsuccessful competitor should be paid anything for his work. In spite of this, the American Institute of Architects, which had procured the passage of the bill, offered to arrange the competition which the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to invite, and architects who would not have entered any other unpaid competition avowed their willingness, for the sake of instituting a better system, to give the Government the benefit of their time and skill in a competition for the first conspicuous and costly building that was to be erected after the passage of the law, the public building at Buffalo. While they were engaged in urging this competition upon the Secretary of the Treasury, the official design for the building was produced and published. Its architectural character was such that the committee of the Institute, composed of architects of high standing, and comprising two of the architects of the World's Fair, felt bound to protest against its execution. Thereupon ensued an acrimonious corre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spondence, in which the President of the Institute declared that the only obstacle to the execution of the law was the unwillingness of the Treasury Department to enforce it, and that the only amendment needed to ensure the satisfactory working of the law was an amendment making the enforcement of it mandatory upon the Secretary of the Treasury, and not discretionary with him. Upon this the Secretary declined to continue the correspondence.

Undoubtedly the Supervising Architect, in his capacity of designer, would deserve sympathy if he appealed for sympathy. We have seen how an artistic and capable Supervising Architect, zealous for the credit of his profession, and zealous for the improvement of the public architecture, deplored the system that made the attainment of the object impossible, and proposed to amend it. A Supervising Architect intent only on magnifying his office, so far from invoking sympathy for his difficulties, challenges admiration for his performances. Indeed the complacency with which a Supervising Architect regards "the system" seems to be pretty accurately in the inverse ratio to his ability in design. It was the author of the Government Building at Jackson Park whom I have already quoted as expressing the opinion that "the system" has produced "substantial and satisfactory results." *Populus me sibilat, at mihi plaudo*—says the Supervising Architect. The Secretary of the Treasury is *ex officio* an inexpert in architecture. It is his misfortune that the responsibility for the public architecture of the country is thrust upon him, and the choice of the person who is to design it. But it is scarcely his misfortune that he does not assist the efforts of the architectural profession to relieve him of any part of a responsibility to which he is necessarily unequal, nor that he opposes his own misinstructed opinion to the unanimous opinion of those whose opinions in this matter have authority. Respecting the official design for the building at Buffalo, against which the body of architects protested, the official answer to their protest is: "It has therefore been determined to proceed with the work in accordance with the design prepared by the Supervising Architect, which is satisfactory to the Department, and which, it is believed, will, when carried into execution, meet the approval of the public." *Populus me sibilat, at mihi plaudo*—says the Secretary of the Treasury.

One of the objections raised in the Treasury Department to the execution of the law authorizing the obtaining of designs was that the cost of architectural service under the proposed law, being the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordinary rate of professional compensation, would be greater than that of "the system." The pretension that architectural service would cost the Government more at the ordinary rate of five per cent than at the actual outlay, Mr. Burnham disposed of by showing that the expenses of the Supervising Architect's office amounted to six per cent of the sum expended under its direction, and that the difference of one per cent would be ample to cover the routine work which would still be left to the office if the public buildings were designed in competition. Mr. Glenn Brown has since contributed to "The American Architect" an exhaustive and statistical comparison of the cost of construction and cost of architectural service of buildings erected under the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and under private architects. He makes the comparison which the Supervising Architect challenges in "the per cubic foot cost of first-class construction." The result of it is that the average cost per cubic foot of fourteen fireproof buildings erected under the direction of the Supervising Architect's office, including the post-offices of Chicago, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, and St. Louis, was 59 cents, and of eight like buildings erected by private architects, including the Ames building in Boston, the court-house in Pittsburg, the Auditorium in Chicago, and the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, was 36 cents. The cost of the public building under "the system" is thus seen to be more than half as great again as the cost of private building.

The same proportion holds respecting the cost of the architectural service from which the Government gets so much less in architecture than better-advised private owners. Mr. Brown has instituted minute researches into this subject also, and the result is that upon certain selected public buildings it appears that the cost of architecture, including superintendence as well as design, would have been six per cent under the conditions of private practice, whereas it actually was a little more than nine per cent. The same result is reached by apportioning the cost of the Supervising Architect's office among the Government buildings under construction. On a total expenditure for buildings in 1891, of $4,620,249, the cost of architectural service would have been, according to the professional schedule, with one per cent added for local superintendence, $277,204. It was, including a pay-roll of $386,500 and the necessary material used, not far from $400,000, or again more than nine per cent on the cost of the work done.

It is not likely that the advocates of the law which has been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nullified by the omission of the Treasury Department to execute it regard competition as an ideal method of obtaining designs for Government buildings. The ideal method is the direct selection of architects by a competent, disinterested, and responsible functionary. This is the method that was followed, with a success so brilliant, in the architecture of the Columbian Exposition. The application of this method to the design of Government buildings would require the creation of an architectural bureau, the headship of which should be an office important enough, by the pay and the rank attached to it, to attract ambitious and successful architects. The practical obstacles to the realization of this ideal are obvious, and the danger is that the office would become a political prize. Practically the Government is restricted to a choice between the opening of the Government architecture to the architectural skill of the country through competitions, as provided by the law of 1893, or to a continuance of "the system." Nobody who is able to appraise the architectural value of "the system" can hesitate between the two methods, or believe that any change could be for the worse. That a system which produces results so crude, extravagant and barbarous, and which shows a progressive deterioration, should have been continued for forty years without radical change, is of itself conclusive proof that neither an elementary knowledge of art nor an interest in it, enlightened or unenlightened, can be said to be generally diffused throughout the United States.

MONTGOMERY SCHUYLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STAGE AS A CAREER: AN ACTOR'S EXPERIENCE.

I DESIRE to draw attention to the actor as a man earning a livelihood, yet at the same time as an artist aspiring to a high ideal, and then to the conditions under which he labors for the attainment of both these ends. In his professional career, as an artist, he is wholly in the hands and at the mercy of a middleman, the manager, and he cannot make the rules which govern his life or work. In few other professions is this true to the same extent. So long as the painter can purchase materials, he can exercise his art and appeal to the public directly and individually if necessary, and the physician, the lawyer, and others are independent of middlemen. The actor, however, no matter how skilful, unless he be a "star"—and "stars" do not come within the scope of this article—must first get a manager to engage him before he can earn a livelihood. When at length an engagement is obtained, his position is by no means secure, for there is inserted in his contract a clause like the following:

> **"If during rehearsals or during the first week's performance the manager shall feel satisfied that the actor is incompetent to perform the duties for which he is engaged, or is inattentive to business, careless in the rendering of characters, or guilty of any violation of the rules made by the manager, then the manager may annul this contract without notice."**

Even if this clause is not written down, it is considered operative as "a recognized rule," "an unwritten law."

The salary of the average player is put down by an eminent authority as not more than $1,500 a year, earned during a season of about thirty weeks. In my opinion this is a high estimate, for $1,200 would be nearer the mark. Out of this the actor—and I use the term to include also the women of the stage—must provide the clothes worn in the play, which are often very costly; he must make a neat appearance in the street, defray his hotel bills, pay for sleeping-cars on night journeys (for it is only in very rare instances that the manager pays for them) and for the luxury of a parlor-car when he can get it. He must also set aside a certain sum to live on during the long interval of twenty or more weeks between seasons, unless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he has a private income or some craft by the exercise of which he may earn money when not acting; and he should make provision also for old age, because, after a certain time, he not only finds it difficult to stand the incessant travel, but with increasing years his opportunities of employment lessen.

Suppose, however, after two or three weeks' study and rehearsals (for which no remuneration is paid), he is deemed satisfactory by the manager; he may yet find himself suddenly thrown out of work because the receipts have not come up to the managerial expectations. The company either disbands or is reorganized—an event which may mean destitution for many who thus find themselves unexpectedly thrown out of employment at a time when no other work is to be obtained. In one day, only a short time ago, no fewer than twenty-eight companies disbanded, throwing at least 280 bread-winners out of employment. But, looking on the brighter side, and assuming a successful engagement, let me set down the average actor's life, as I know it, as I have lived it, without those accidental hardships which may be called exceptional misfortunes. Let me show the conditions under which a man with honest purpose and a high artistic aim is compelled to live.

The welfare of the actor is menaced to-day from within and from without: from within, by the managers, the "stars," and the actors themselves; from without, by the public and the press.

But first let me explain the different kinds of managers: There are (1) the few men who manage the theatres which employ stock companies, and to most of these the following remarks are not applicable; (2) those who employ "stars" and travelling companies; (3) the "stars" who are also the proprietors of the companies "supporting" them, and, as such, are managers, although they have so-called managers who look after the details and the business side of the organizations and who also may have a proprietary interest; (4) the local managers, who are not managers at all, but only janitors, who take care of the theatres which they "book" for a percentage of the gross receipts.

The janitor has an important bearing on the actor's condition, which finds its expression in his playing, and possibly on his nervous organization. He supplies the house, and, in most cases, furnishes quarters for the actors such as no self-respecting slave-owner would in the old days have condemned a slave to occupy.

For the public nothing is too good: fine silken draperies hang in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the boxes; soft, comfortable chairs are in the auditorium, which is as handsomely and harmoniously decorated as the architect's scheme and the owner's purse will allow. For the actor, on the other hand, anything is good enough. Instead of silken draperies, he finds only a tattered curtain at the window, if, indeed, he find a curtain at all, or even a window which it might cover. Instead of soft, comfortable chairs, one wooden chair none too clean, or a chair minus a back, will be the only seat, and not infrequently, if he wishes to sit down, he must do so on the edge of his trunk. Instead of delicately tinted walls, he will find dirty walls which have not been treated even to a coat of whitewash for years. While in the auditorium a soft carpet covers the floor, in the actor's room a carpet rarely exists, or, if by chance there be something which once was a carpet, it is so dirty that it would be better away. The washing-appliances of the actor's room, if they are found at all, usually consist of a small basin with a tap of running water. Most people would expect that, as the winter is the theatrical season and the paints used by the actors are made with grease, hot water would be at hand. But this is rarely the case, and in many instances running water in the dressing-rooms is unknown. It is not uncommon for actors to refrain from using the basins, preferring to remove the "make up" as well as possible with vaseline, and to wait until the hotel is reached to complete this portion of the toilet. Tin basins and buckets are not the worst that I have seen "on the road," for once the water was in dirty, battered, old lard-tins, and basins had to be bought by our manager.

It is seldom that the actor, other than the "star" or leading man, gets a room to himself, frequently having to share his discomforts with several members of the company. The room may be under the stage or in the "flies," or even higher. In either case the lack of ventilation is appalling, the heat under the stage being exceeded only by the heat above it, and it is a wonder that actors do not die by the score of throat and lung complaints induced by draughts in an overheated atmosphere. The stage door invariably opens directly on the stage, permitting blasts of cold air to sweep through the region behind the curtain. The room is often damp, and I have dressed with three other gentlemen in a theatre in one of the large cities, where we had to step across a pool of water in the middle of the room.

But before entrance to the dressing-room can be gained, the stage door must be passed. The imposing front of the theatre and its brilliant lighting are for the public's use and gaze, but the idea that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anything is good enough for the actor is carried out in the stage entrance. If it happens to be in a street instead of an alley-way,—and alleys are always dirty—it is almost certain that the door will be up or down a narrow flight of steps, at the bottom of which there is invariably in wet weather a pool of water. The stage itself may or may not be clean. I remember once in Chicago noticing that the stage of one of the chief theatres was, to put it delicately, somewhat soiled, and I asked one of the men how often it was washed. "Oh! we never get time to wash it," he replied. "You see we have Sunday-night performances, and we are always using it, so we can only sweep it. Yes; it does look a bit dusty, does n't it?"

One point relating to the house behind the scenes, which demands serious attention, is the possibility of escape in the event of fire. The stairs leading to the dressing-rooms, though some are made of stone or iron, as a rule are made of wood so dry that they would burn like tinder, and they are frequently so narrow that two people cannot pass on them. I shudder to think what would happen to the actors if a fire should break out in almost any of the theatres in which I have played. Nearly all are veritable fire-traps, and, if the stairs were burned, escape would be well-nigh impossible. The fire-inspectors apparently confine their attention to the front of the house, or are easily contented with half a dozen hand-grenades, fewer buckets of water, and a few feet of hose as precautions.

Such is the condition "behind the scenes," as noted absolutely within my own observation. Will any honest-minded man say that it is not a degradation to be condemned to occupy such rooms? Is there any one—outside the dramatic profession—who would care to subject a fellow-being to these conditions, especially a fellow-being through the exercise of whose abilities he makes his living, and whose work depends greatly on the proper use of the emotional faculties, which are largely influenced by surroundings? It is not much that the actor asks. He never thinks of anything approaching luxury in a theatre, but he does ask—he has a right to demand—cleanliness.

For the disgraceful condition of the theatres the janitor, of course, is primarily responsible, but he has accessories in crime in the persons of the manager of the company, the "star," and even in the actor himself. If half a dozen of the leading "stars" and managers were to combine and inform a janitor that they would not play in his house unless the dressing-rooms were put into proper repair and order, clean quarters would replace the present squalor and dirt. Or if the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manager and the "star," when the contract for the engagement was made, put in a clause insisting on the dressing-rooms being neat and clean, and, finding them otherwise, refuse to allow the company to act, and give the reason, public opinion would unquestionably insist on the theatre being made decent. Moreover, the result would be an advertisement—the dearest object to the managerial heart—which could not easily be overestimated. Such a manager would be hailed as a public-spirited man, and his company would probably play to crowded houses for the rest of the season. But at present the manager is usually content to confine his attention to the box-office.

The "star" does not trouble himself about the comfort of the actor, because his mind is fully occupied, and his own comfort is pretty well looked after. The best room in the theatre is usually known as "the star's"; its name is even printed on the door, as if there were a possibility of its being mistaken. Besides being larger than the rest, it is nearly always on the stage floor; it is furnished with some pretensions to comfort; the floor is covered with a carpet; it has light, and there are decent washing-appliances. For these reasons, and because nearly every "star" thinks himself altogether on a different plane from the actors in his "support," intercourse between him and them is not intimate, and he does not hear of their discomforts and degradations—at least until they are past remedying.[1]

The average theatrical manager—not the "star" actor-manager, for he has ambition and professional pride in his work outside mere money considerations—is a vulgarian, a speculator who deals in plays and players as other speculators gamble in wheat, pork, or stocks, and money is the be-all and the end-all of his existence. Men and women, with their brains and sensitive nervous organizations, are to him the means to his end, and he cares as much for them as other speculators care for the wares they deal in.

There is a tension in a theatre during a performance which can be distinctly felt; and after the play is over the reaction comes, and with it the need of repose. How does the manager satisfy this need, especially when playing in one-night stands? By arranging to leave

[1] An exception must be made here, which it is a pleasure to record. Mr. E. S. Willard, one of the most popular "stars" in the country, has refused to book engagements in several theatres because of the filthy condition of the dressing-rooms. The significance of this will be the better understood when it is remembered that Mr. Willard plays only in the best houses. If he will continue this good work, he will earn the gratitude of every actor who plays in these houses, and in time perhaps his example may be followed by other "stars."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by as late a train next day as possible, one would think. Nothing of the kind. For this gentleman there is usually but one train out of town, and it leaves at some time about seven o'clock in the morning, requiring the calling of the actors at six or earlier. Playing long pieces, packing after the play, and the necessary supper reduce the hours of rest in such a case to six hours or less, and then follows a jolting journey after an uncomfortable and hurried meal,—a journey from two to ten hours, and in an ordinary coach, for the average actor's salary does not permit the luxury of a parlor-car. All this is bad enough for a man, but think of the woman who has to face the same conditions. Bad weather makes no difference. The journey must be taken. The street-cars do not run all night in the smaller cities, the station omnibus may not come, and the actress may have to walk through rain or snow to the station, and travel until her wet clothes dry on her. The wonder is that more of them do not fall ill. Think of her condition if she become so ill that she cannot proceed with the company. Left behind in a hotel, generally a cheap one, among strangers who are not interested in her welfare, the picture need not be painted in detail to bring home its disconsolateness.

It not infrequently happens on these one-night stands that after travelling hard all day one has to start immediately after the performance, or at such an hour that it is useless to think of going to bed before the journey is begun. If the journey extends far into the day, the actor has to take his meals at some wayside station or railway restaurant, where only vile cooking and dyspepsia are to be found. After all this fatigue, he may arrive only just in time to get another hasty and wretched meal before the next performance.

In spite of these hardships, he must, for his own sake, keep up to his artistic standard. Think for a moment of the strain under these conditions when the part makes exhaustive demands on the emotional nature, for even the leading actors have often to suffer the same hardships of travel, since the parlor-cars they can so well afford may not be attached to the train. This sort of travel may go on for a week, even for months. Then the actor loses almost all chance of study and opportunity for thought, and is in imminent danger of becoming a dramatic drummer rather than an artist. In the large cities, where longer engagements are played, comfort of course may be found, and such engagements are always hailed with delight; but anything more wearying than this incessant travel it would be hard to find.

The childlike way in which actors are treated when on a journey

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deserves notice. The manager carries their tickets, a system for which various invalid excuses are made, such as that tickets are not issued for a company, but an order is made out for a certain number of people to travel between certain points, and that "the actors may lose their tickets if they have them." The consequence is, that, when the conductor comes in, the actor has to explain who he is, or not infrequently the manager accompanies the conductor, and with outstretched finger and in loud tones he points out the members of the company, thus: "That's one: there's another," and so on, while the other travellers stare at those who are thus indicated. A mere detail, some people will say. Perhaps—but it is just such details of our lives that irritate. But it is not only in such things that the manager shows his lack of consideration for the actor. The rules he makes and compels the actor to sign are simply insulting. Here are some which are copied from a contract and are in general use:

"Any person, employed in this company, acting improperly, talking loudly, or using language calculated to produce a quarrel, shall forfeit five dollars, and be liable to be discharged, at the option of the manager.

"The manager reserves to himself the right to discharge from the company all persons who shall be guilty of conduct unbecoming ladies or gentlemen, and calculated to bring disrepute on this organization; also all who shall conspire against the interests of the manager, defame the members of the company, make public the private affairs of the concern, or by other conduct manifest a disposition to throw obstacles in the way of the management.

"*Any new rule which shall be found necessary shall be considered part of these rules and regulations.*"

The actor has no alternative but to sign them. He knows, and the manager knows, that if he does not sign them there are dozens of others waiting anxiously for the chance of taking his place—often at even a smaller salary than he is receiving. It is this fact on which the manager trades.

If the manager has no money, he carefully conceals this fact, engages a company, gets men and women to give time to study parts, to rehearse, to expend money for dresses; and he takes them away from home in the hope that the play he has selected will attract. If it does, well and good; the players will—at all events may—get their salaries, or a portion of them. If it does not, the company "bursts up," and the actors have to get home as best they can, or, if they are fortunate enough to be brought home by the manager, they have only idleness and possibly want to which to look forward. In a measure the actors have themselves to blame, but many of them learn

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing by experience and may suffer again forthwith from exactly the same conditions.

Indeed, when all is said, the fact remains that the actors themselves are most to blame for the abuses they suffer, because they have it in their own hands to unite and say, "This shall not be." If, however, any one were to propose an Actors' Union, he would be met with a yell of execration which might well make him quail. One would hear of nothing but "degrading the artist to the level of the artisan," as if the artisan's calling were not worthy all respect and honor. There is, however, another probable reason why actors will not combine, and I have already hinted at it—fear of the manager, who, they know, has many applications for all the positions he can offer. Anything like concerted action by actors, for their own benefit, is unknown. Yet, if there were a union among actors, they could compel managers to treat their companies as they should be treated, or else force them out of business. The better class of people who are daily going on the stage will, I hope, not long submit to these managerial methods.

The classes of people from which recruits come to the stage deserve notice. Some are men and women who with high purpose take up the study of the actor's art with true motives, with the belief that the stage affords them at once the best means for the cultivation and development of their particular artistic talent and its expression. They are the hope of those who desire the stage to take, in the public estimation, the lead among the arts by virtue of the subject with which at its best it deals,—the play of human emotions.

This class of people is, however, not the only class that enters the portals of stage-land, which are wide open and left unguarded. Wealth may obtain entrance, and, given wealth, any man may take out a company. His career as a "star" is not even limited by the sum that he can afford to lose; for with a clever press-agent there are dozens of meretricious methods by which the public may be so interested as to be willing—nay anxious—to pay to see him, if not to see him act; and so long as people go to the theatre no one knows or cares what motives induce the visit. Influence, too, will put a man in a place and keep him there; for the public has no redress against the manager who ignores his obligation to it, since it has paid in advance for the performance. In the other artistic professions these conditions cannot exist. But there is no bar to the public appearance of the aspirant for stage honors. He has merely to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

walk on the stage and announce his presence, even in faulty English. If he can amuse an audience it is of absolutely no importance how he does it—provided he does not overstep the elastic limit of what is regarded as public decency. He may be absolutely uneducated, and unacquainted even with the technique of stagecraft, without refinement, or culture, or the ability to speak a sentence correctly,—yet he may occupy a prominent position.

That this state of things exists is, in my opinion, due in part at least to the reign of so-called farce-comedy. This, the public is gravely assured by men who profess to know, is the very thing it wants, and because they say it often enough and loudly enough the public really more than half believes them, walks meekly up to the box office, and pays a dollar and a half a head to see something at which it may indeed laugh, but goes home wondering what on earth it could have laughed at. These entertainments, which seem to most refined people "neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red-herring," give employment to a large number of "specialty artists." The study required to win success in this line of work is frequently none at all, although for some such work—*e.g.*, dancing—constant and arduous practice is necessary. A successful "specialty artist" is generally one with a curious bent of humor or some peculiar faculty, and all that is necessary is to exhibit it—himself or herself—to win very great rewards.

No one wishes to find fault with this reward, since it is the personal equation which gives all art its value; but the point I desire to make is that in consequence of this a man of no refinement, culture, or education gets into a prominent position, and by virtue of that position becomes—unconsciously perhaps—one of the standards by which the public judges actors. So long as people of this class behave themselves properly, no great harm is done, but unrefined men, especially when they are making a great deal of money, do not as a rule conduct themselves in such ways as to make them desirable companions in a drawing-room. They are likely to be boisterous, and obtrusive in manner, dress, and style. Those who are not before the public eye are simply passed over by the public in silence; but everybody in his hotel knows John Smith—only his name never is John Smith—"the popular artist who creates roars of laughter every night at so-and-so's theatre"; and one will not have to listen long to hear many remarks on the "loudness and vulgarity of these actor people," though it is never the loudness and vulgarity of John Smith the individual which are commented on, but of the profession of which he is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a member,—a confounding of the greater with the less. It is not, of course, on the "variety" or "farce-comedy" stage only that people of this class are found. There are other companies producing meretricious stuff, which employ large numbers of unrefined people. Knowing, however, how sensitive are the feelings of my brethren of the stage, I hasten to add that I am well aware that there is a large number of people of refinement engaged even in these fields of work, and I am confident that they feel as keenly as I do on this point.

But people who have obtained notoriety in any way use the stage as the vehicle for the exhibition of their personalities. Those also who yearn for notoriety, for excitement, for the vulgar but not uncommon desire to see their names in print, for any of the thousand and one reasons which vanity may suggest and publicity will ensure, —all rush to the stage to gratify their desires. Again, many people go on the stage because it offers them the opportunity for leisure, to loaf, to hang around hotel corridors and bar-rooms: and, since most companies play but one piece during the season, when once it is produced the actors have to go to the theatre only for the performance and are able to indulge their lazy proclivities to the full. These help to keep up the idea that "actors are a lazy, shiftless lot."

Before these evils can be abolished, the press and the public must change their attitude toward the actor, and agree to regard him as they regard other members of the community. The initial step in this movement must necessarily be taken by the press, which moulds public opinion. To-day, anything concerning an actor is "good news," and is invariably worth a "scare head." Matters which do not concern the public are described in more or less sensational style—generally more than less. The actor's private life is not safe from intrusion. In the first place the press has got so accustomed to serving up this kind of stuff that it has developed in the public an unhealthy appetite for it, and now believes that it must go on supplying this matter in consequence of the demand. Then the public, having got used to it, does gossip inordinately about the private lives of actors, and, in the desire to gratify this unhealthy appetite, is willing to degrade itself and the actor by discussing the vulgarest details. Lastly, the actors about whom this cheap stuff is written are keenly alive to the so-called advantages of the advertisement. They court publicity and recount their deeds in the hope—nay, with the expectation—that they will be reported by the newspaper-men

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who frequent their haunts. They would rather be held up for public censure than not be spoken of at all.

The new birth of the stage—using the word to denote all the conditions affecting the player—will occur only when managers begin to recognize that they have a duty to perform to their companies, to treat them with consideration and make sure of their comfort; when the "stars" who are also the proprietors of their companies realize the same facts; when those who are not proprietors demean themselves properly toward those who "support" them; and when actors themselves as a class learn that there is a dignity in their profession, the recognition of which they alone can compel, by respecting it themselves in their daily life, and by refusing to pander to sensationalism in order to obtain a cheap advertisement. Then the press and the public alike will hold a different view of the player; the actor's view of his own dignity in his profession will beget a higher estimate outside it; and the stage will be in public regard on the same plane as the other artistic professions. Then players as a class will be treated with that consideration and respect which is now in some instances bestowed on them as individuals.

RUDOLPH DE CORDOVA.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED